arXiv:1104.1691v1 [math.AP] 9 Apr 2011

A singular parabolic equation: existence, stabilization

Mehdi Badra, Kaushik Bal, and Jacques Giacomoni

Abstract. We investigate the following quasilinear parabolic and singular equation,

$$\begin{cases} u_t - \Delta_p u = \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u) \ \text{ in } \ (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ u = 0 \ \text{ on } (0,T)\times\partial\Omega, \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \ (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x) \ \text{ in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{P_t}$$

where Ω is an open bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{N}}$, $1 < p < \infty$, $0 < \delta$ and $T > 0$. We assume that $(x,s) \in \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+ \to f(x,s)$ is a bounded below Caratheodory function, locally Lipschitz with respect to s uniformly in $x \in \Omega$ and asymptotically sub-homogeneous, i.e.

$$0 \le \lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{f(x,t)}{t^{p-1}} = \alpha_f < \lambda_1(\Omega), \tag{0.1}$$

(where $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta_p$ in Ω with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions) and $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)\cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, satisfying a cone condition defined below. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 2+\frac{1}{p-1})$, we prove the existence and the uniqueness of a weak solution $u \in \mathbf{V}(Q_T)$ to (P_t). Furthermore, $u \in C([0,T], W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ and the restriction $\delta < 2+\frac{1}{p-1}$ is sharp. The proof involves a semi-discretization in time approach and the study of the stationary problem associated to $(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{t}})$. The key points in the proof is to show that u belongs to the cone $\mathcal{C}$ defined below and by the weak comparison principle that $\frac{1}{u^\delta} \in L^\infty(0,T;W^{-1,p'}(\Omega))$ and $u^{1-\delta} \in L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\Omega))$. When $t \to \frac{f(x,t)}{t^{p-1}}$ is non--increasing for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, we show that $u(t) \to u_\infty$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $t \to \infty$, where u_∞ is the unique solution to the stationary problem. This stabilization property is proved by using the accretivity of a suitable operator in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Finally, in the last section we analyse the case $p = 2$. Using the interpolation spaces theory and the semigroup theory, we prove the existence and the uniqueness of weak solutions to (P_t) for any $\delta > 0$ in $C([0,T], L^2(\Omega))\cap L^\infty(Q_T)$ and under suitable assumptions on the initial data we give additional regularity results. Finally, we describe their asymptotic behaviour in $L^\infty(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ when $\delta < 3$.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35J65, 35J20; Secondary 35J70.

Key words and phrases. quasilinear parabolic equation, singular nonlinearity, existence of weak solution, weak comparison principle, sub and supersolutions, cone condition, time-semi-discretization, semigroup theory for non-linear operators.

Introduction

In the present paper we investigate the following quasilinear and singular parabolic problem :

$$(\mathrm{P}_t)\qquad \begin{cases} u_t - \Delta_p u = \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u) \ \text{ in } \ Q_T, \\ u = 0 \ \text{ on } \Sigma_T, \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \ Q_T, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x) \ \text{ in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is an open bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{N}}$ (with $\mathrm{N} \geq 2$), $1 < p < \infty$, $0 < \delta$, $T > 0$, $Q_T = (0,T) \times \Omega$ and $\Sigma_T = (0,T) \times \partial\Omega$. We assume that f is a bounded below Caratheodory function, locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable uniformly in $x \in \Omega$ and satisfying (0.1) and $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Such a problem arises in different models: non newtonian flows, chemical hetereogeneous catalyst kinetics, combustion. We refer to the survey Hernández-Mancebo-Vega [**19**], the book Ghergu-Radulescu [**14**] and the bibliography therein for more details about the corresponding models. One of our main goals is to prove the existence and the uniqueness of the weak solution to (P_t). We define the notion of weak solution for the following more general problem

$$(\mathrm{S}_t) \begin{cases} u_t - \Delta_p u = \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} + h(x,t) \ \text{ in } \ Q_T, \\ u = 0 \ \text{ on } \Sigma_T, \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \ Q_T, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x) \ \text{ in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $0 < T$, $h \in L^\infty(Q_T)$, $0 < \delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$, $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, as follows

Definition 0.1.

$$\mathbf{V}(Q_T) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ u \,:\, u \in L^\infty(Q_T),\, u_t \in L^2(Q_T),\, u \in L^\infty(0,T; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)) \Big\}$$

and

Definition 0.2. A *weak* solutions to (S_t) is a function $u \in \mathbf{V}(Q_T)$ satisfying

1. for any compact $K \subset Q_T$, $\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_K u > 0$,
2. for every test function $\phi \in \mathbf{V}(Q_T)$,
$$\int_{Q_T} \left(\phi \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \phi - \phi(\frac{1}{u^\delta} + h(t,x)) \right) \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}t = 0,$$
3. $u(0,x) = u_0(x)$ a.e in Ω.

Remark 0.3. Since every $u \in \mathbf{V}(Q_T)$ belongs to $C(0,T;\, L^2(\Omega))$, the third point of the above definition is meaningful.

The approach we use is to study first the existence of solutions to the stationary problem (P) that is for $g \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $\lambda > 0$

$$(\mathrm{P}) \begin{cases} u - \lambda\big(\Delta_p u + \dfrac{1}{u^\delta}\big) & = g \quad \text{in } \ \Omega, \\ \hfill u & = 0 \quad \text{on } \ \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

To control the singular term $\frac{1}{u^\delta}$, we need to consider solutions in a conical shell $\mathcal{C}$ defined as the set of functions $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that there exists $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$

satisfying

$$\begin{cases} c_1 d(x) \leq v \leq c_2 d(x) & \text{if } \ \delta < 1, \\ c_1 d(x) \log^{\frac{1}{p}}(\dfrac{k}{d(x)}) \leq v \leq c_2 d(x) \log^{\frac{1}{p}}(\dfrac{k}{d(x)}) & \text{if } \ \delta = 1, \\ c_1 d(x)^{\frac{p}{\delta+p-1}} \leq v \leq c_2 \left(d(x)^{\frac{p}{\delta+p-1}} + d(x) \right) & \text{if } \ \delta > 1, \end{cases}$$

where $d(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ and $k > 0$ is large enough. Regarding Problem (P), we prove the following

Theorem 0.4. *Let* $g \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ *and* $0 < \delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$. *Then for any* $\lambda > 0$, *problem* (P) *admits a unique solution* u_λ *in* $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C} \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$.

Concerning the case where $\delta \geq 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$, we prove the following

Theorem 0.5. *Let* $g \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ *and* $\delta \geq 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$. *Then for any* $\lambda > 0$, *problem* (P) *admits a solution* u_λ *in* $W^{1,p}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C} \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ *such that* $u_\lambda \notin W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

In view of establishing Theorem 0.12 below, we need to prove the following result:

Theorem 0.6. *Let* $0 < \delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$ *and* $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a bounded below Caratheodory function, locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable uniformly in* $x \in \Omega$, *satisfying* (0.1) *and such that* $\frac{f(x,s)}{s^{p-1}}$ *is a decreasing function in* $\mathbb{R}^+$ *for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$. *Then there exists a unique* u_∞ *in* $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C} \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ *satisfying*

$$\text{(Q)} \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u_\infty - \dfrac{1}{u_\infty^\delta} & = f(x, u_\infty) \quad \text{in } \ \Omega, \\ \qquad\qquad u_\infty & = 0 \qquad\qquad\ \ \text{on } \ \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Using a time discretization method, Theorem 0.4, energy estimates and the weak comparison principle (see Cuesta-Takáč [**7**], Fleckinger-Takáč [**13**]), we prove the following

Theorem 0.7. *Let* $0 < \delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$, $h \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ *and* $u_0 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}$. *Then there exists a unique weak solution* u *to*

$$\begin{cases} u_t - \Delta_p u = \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} + h(x,t) \ \ \text{in } \ Q_T, \\ u = 0 \ \ \text{on } \ \Sigma_T, \quad u > 0 \ \text{in } \ Q_T, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x) \ \ \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{0.2}$$

such that $u(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ *uniformly for* $t \in [0,T]$. *Moreover,* u *belongs to* $C([0,T], W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ *and satisfies for any* $t \in [0,T]$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \int_\Omega (\frac{\partial u}{\partial t})^2 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \quad + \quad \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u(t)|^p \mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_\Omega u^{1-\delta}(t)\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_0^t \int_\Omega h\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \quad + \quad \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^p \mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_\Omega u_0^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{0.3}$$

Remark 0.8. Saying that $u(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ uniformly for $t \in [0,T]$ means that there exists $\underline{u}$, $\overline{u} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\underline{u}(x) \leq u(t,x) \leq \overline{u}(x)$ a.e $(x,t) \in \Omega \times [0,T]$.

Remark 0.9. By Theorem 0.5, the restriction $\delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$ is sharp.

Moreover, we have the following regularity result for solutions to (0.2) which is obtained from the theory of nonlinear monotone operators of [**4**]:

Proposition 0.1. *Assume that hypotheses of Theorem 0.7 are satisfied and set:*

$$\mathcal{D}(A) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ v \in \mathcal{C} \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \,|\, Av \overset{\text{def}}{=} -\Delta_p v - \frac{1}{v^\delta} \in L^\infty(\Omega) \right\}. \tag{0.4}$$

If in addition $u_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, then the solution u to (0.2) *belongs to $C([0,T]; C_0(\overline{\Omega}))$ and satisfies*

(i) *if v is another weak solution to (S_t) with initial datum $v_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ and nonhomogeneous term $k \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ then the following estimate holds:*

$$\|u(t)-v(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|u_0-v_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|h(s)-k(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \mathrm{d}s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{0.5}$$

(ii) *if $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and $h \in W^{1,1}(0,T; L^\infty(\Omega))$ then $u \in W^{1,\infty}(0,T; L^\infty(\Omega))$ and $\Delta_p u + u^{-\delta} \in L^\infty(Q_T)$, and the following estimate holds:*

$$\left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}u(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\Delta_p u_0 + u_0^{-\delta} + h(0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^T \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}h(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \mathrm{d}\tau. \tag{0.6}$$

Concerning problem (P_t), we have the following

Theorem 0.10. *Let $0 < \delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$. Assume that f is a bounded below Caratheodory function, and that f is locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable uniformly in $x \in \Omega$ and satisfying* (0.1). *Let $u_0 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}$. Then, for any $T > 0$, there exists a unique weak solution, u, to* $(\mathrm{P_t})$ *such that $u(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ uniformly for $t \in [0,T]$, $u \in C([0,T], W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ and u satisfies for any $t \in [0,T]$:*

$$\int_0^t \int_\Omega \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\right)^2 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \quad + \quad \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u(t)|^p \mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_\Omega u^{1-\delta}(t)\mathrm{d}x \tag{0.7}$$
$$= \int_\Omega F(x,u(t))\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^p \mathrm{d}x \quad - \quad \frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_\Omega u_0^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega F(x,u_0)\mathrm{d}x,$$

where $F(x,w) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^w f(x,s)\mathrm{d}s$.

A straightforward application of Proposition 0.1 yields the following

Proposition 0.2. *Assume that conditions in Theorem 0.10 are satisfied. If in addition $u_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, then the solution u to* $(\mathrm{P_t})$ *belongs to $C([0,T]; C_0(\overline{\Omega}))$ and*

(i) *there exists $\omega > 0$ such that if v is another weak solution to (P_t) with initial datum $v_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ then the following estimate holds:*

$$\|u(t)-v(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq e^{\omega t}\|u_0-v_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

(ii) *if $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ then $u \in W^{1,\infty}(0,T; L^\infty(\Omega))$ and $\Delta_p u + u^{-\delta} \in L^\infty(Q_T)$, and the following estimate holds:*

$$\left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}u(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq e^{\omega t}\|\Delta_p u_0 + u_0^{-\delta} + f(x,u_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

Remark 0.11. The constant ω given above is equal to the Lipschitz constant of $f(x,\cdot)$ on $[\underline{u},\overline{u}]$ where $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ are respectively subsolution and supersolution to (Q) given in (3.2) and (3.3) below.

From Theorems 0.10 and 0.6, we can show the following asymptotic behaviour for solutions to (P_t):

Theorem 0.12. *Let hypothesis in Theorem 0.10 satisfied and assume that* $\frac{f(x,s)}{s^{p-1}}$ *is decreasing in* $(0,\infty)$ *for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$. *Then, the solution to* (P_t) *is defined in* $(0,\infty)\times\Omega$ *and satisfies*

$$u(t) \to u_\infty \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \to \infty, \tag{0.8}$$

where u_∞ *is defined in Theorem 0.6.*

Concerning the non degenerate case, i.e $p = 2$, we can give additional results. In particular, we prove the existence of solutions in the sense of distributions for any $0 < \delta$. Precisely,

Theorem 0.13. *Let* $0 < \delta$ *and* $p = 2$. *Let* f *satisfy assumptions in Theorem 0.10 and* $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}$. *Then, for any* $T > 0$, *there exists a unique solution* $u \in C([0,T], L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(Q_T)$ *to* (P_t) *in the sense of distributions, that is* $u \in \mathcal{C}$ *uniformly in* $t \in [0,T]$ *and for any* $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(Q_T)$, *we have*

$$-\int_{Q_T} u\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t}\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t - \int_{Q_T} u\Delta\phi\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t = \int_{Q_T}\left(\frac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u)\right)\phi\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t. \tag{0.9}$$

In addition, we have for $0 < \eta$ *small enough, the following regularity property:*

(i) *if* $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ *and* $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap H^{2-\eta}(\Omega)$, *then* $u \in C\big([0,T];\, H^{2-\eta}(\Omega)\big)$;

(ii) *if* $\frac{1}{2} \le \delta < 1$ *and* $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap H^{\frac{5}{2}-\delta-\eta}(\Omega)$, *then* $u \in C\big([0,T], H^{\frac{5}{2}-\delta-\eta}(\Omega)\big)$;

(iii) *if* $1 \le \delta$ *and* $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2}{\delta+1}-\eta}(\Omega)$, *then* $u \in C\big([0,T], H^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2}{\delta+1}-\eta}(\Omega)\big)$.

Moreover,

(iv) *if* u_1, u_2 *are solutions corresponding to initial data* $u_{1,0} \in \mathcal{C}$, $u_{2,0} \in \mathcal{C}$ *respectively, then there exist* $\underline{u}$, $\overline{u}$ *in* $\mathcal{C}$ *and a positive constant* ω *(proportional to the lipschitz constant of* $f(x,\cdot)$ *in* $[0, \|\overline{u}\|_\infty]$*) such that*

$$\|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le e^{(\omega-\lambda_1)t}\|u_{1,0} - u_{2,0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{u} \le u^i \le \overline{u},\ i = 1,2. \tag{0.10}$$

(v) *if* $f(x,\cdot)$ *is a nonincreasing function then* (0.10) *is true with* $\omega = 0$. *Then, the solution to* (P_t), u, *defined in* $(0,\infty)$ *satisfies* $u(t) \to u_\infty$ *as* $t \to +\infty$ *in* $L^2(\Omega)$ *where* u_∞ *is the solution given in Theorem 0.6.*

Remark 0.14. In particular, if $\delta < 3$ and $u_0 \in H^1_0(\Omega)$, then we recover $u \in C([0,T]; H^1_0(\Omega))$. Note also that for arbitrary $\delta > 0$ there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $u \in C([0,T]; H_0^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}(\Omega))$ if $u_0 \in H_0^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}(\Omega)$.

Theorem 0.13 is established using the interpolation theory in Sobolev spaces and the $L^p - L^q$-maximal regularity results of the linear heat equation. Under the assumptions given in Theorem 0.6, we can derive from Theorem 0.13 some stabilization properties. Precisely, we prove

Theorem 0.15. *Let* $p = 2$, $\delta < 3$, $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$. *Assume that* f *satisfies assumptions of Theorem 0.12. Then, the solution to* (P_t), u, *defined in* $(0,\infty)\times\Omega$ *satisfies* $u(t) \to u_\infty$ *as* $t \to +\infty$ *in* $L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ *where* u_∞ *is the solution given in Theorem 0.6.*

We give now briefly the state of art concerning parabolic quasilinear singular equations. The corresponding stationary equation was studied profusely in the litterature. In particular the case $p = 2$, mostly when $\delta < 1$ and also when g depends on u was considered in detail (see the pionniering work CRANDALL-RABINOWITZ-TARTAR [**6**], the bibliography in HERNÁNDEZ-MANCEBO [**18**] and PERERA-SILVA [**23**]). The case $p \neq 2$ was not considered so far. We can mention the work ARANDA-GODOY [**3**] where existence results are obtained via the bifurcation theory for $1 < p \leq 2$ and $g = g(u)$ satisfying some growth conditions. In GIACOMONI-SCHINDLER-TAKÁČ [**15**] the existence and multiplicity results (for $1 < p < \infty$ $g(u) = u^q$ with $p - 1 < q \leq p^* - 1$ and $0 < \delta < 1$ are proved by using variational methods and regularity results in Hölder spaces. Concerning the parabolic case, avalaible results mostly concern the case $p = 2$. In this regard, we can quote the result in HERNANDEZ-MANCEBO-VEGA [**19**] where in the range $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$, properties of the linearised operator (in $C^1_0(\overline{\Omega})$) and the validity of the strong maximum principle are studied. In TAKÁČ [**25**], a stabilization result in C^1 is proved for a class of parabolic singular problems via a clever use of weighted Sobolev spaces. We also mention the work DAVILA-MONTENEGRO [**8**] still concerning the case $p = 2$ and with singular absorption term. In this nice work, the authors achieved uniqueness within the class of functions satisfying $u(x,t) \geq c\,\mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)^\gamma$ for suitable γ and $c > 0$ and discuss the asymptotic behaviour of solutions. Finally, we would like to quote the nice paper WINKLER [**30**] where the author shows that uniqueness is violated in case of non homogeneous boundary Dirichlet condition.

The present paper is organized as follows. The two next sections (Section 1, Section 2) contain the proofs of Theorems 0.4, 0.5, 0.7 and Proposition 0.1. Theorems 0.6, 0.10, 0.12 and Proposition 0.2 are established in section 3. Finally, the non degenerate case (i.e. $p = 2$) is dealt in Section 4 where in particular Theorems 0.13 and 0.15 are proved.

1. Proof of Theorems 0.4 and 0.5

We first prove Theorem 0.4.

PROOF. First, let us consider the case $\delta < 1$. For $\lambda > 0$, we define the following energy functional :

$$E_\lambda(u) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega u^2 \mathrm{d}x + \frac{\lambda}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \mathrm{d}x - \frac{\lambda}{1-\delta}\int_\Omega (u^+)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega gu\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

E_λ is well-defined in $X = W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ if $p \geq \frac{2\mathrm{N}}{\mathrm{N}+2}$. If $1 < p < \frac{2\mathrm{N}}{\mathrm{N}+2}$, E_λ is well-defined in $X = W^{1,p}_0(\Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega)$. It is easy to see that E_λ is stricly convex, continuous and coercive in X. Thus, since X is reflexive, E_λ admits a unique global minimizer denoted by u_λ. We show now that $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$. Let ϕ_1 be the normalized positive eigenfunction associated with the principal eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ of $-\Delta_p$ with homogeneous boundary Dirichlet conditions (see ANANE [**1**], [**2**] for further details):

$$-\Delta_p\phi_1 = \lambda_1\,|\phi_1|^{p-2}\phi_1 \quad \text{in } \Omega; \qquad \phi_1 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \tag{1.1}$$

$\phi_1 \in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ is normalized by $\phi_1 > 0$ in Ω and $\int_\Omega \phi_1^p\,\mathrm{d}x = 1$. Note that the strong maximum and boundary point principles from VÁZQUEZ [**29**, Theorem 5, p. 200] guarantee $\phi_1 > 0$ in Ω and $\frac{\partial\phi_1}{\partial\nu} < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, respectively. Hence, since $\phi_1 \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, there are constants ℓ and L, $0 < \ell < L$, such that $\ell\, d(x) \leq \phi_1(x) \leq L\, d(x)$ for all $x \in \Omega$. Moreover, we observe that for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough (depending on λ, δ and

g) we have

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{rll}
\epsilon\phi_1 - \lambda(\Delta_p(\epsilon\phi_1) + \dfrac{1}{(\epsilon\phi_1)^\delta}) & < g & \text{in } \Omega,\\
\epsilon\phi_1 & = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega.
\end{array}
\right.
\tag{1.2}
$$

Thus, for $t > 0$, we set $v_\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\epsilon\phi_1 - u_\lambda)^+$ and $\chi(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E_\lambda(u_\lambda + tv_\lambda)$. From the Hardy Inequality, it follows that χ is differentiable for $t \in (0, 1]$ and

$$\chi'(t) =< E'_\lambda(u_\lambda + tv_\lambda), v_\lambda > .$$

The optimality of u_λ guarantees $\chi'(0) = 0$ and the strict convexity of E_λ ensures that $t \to \chi'(t)$ is increasing. Therefore, with (1.2) we obtain that

$$0 < \chi'(1) =< E'_\lambda(\epsilon\phi_1), v_\lambda >< 0$$

if v_λ has non-zero measure support. Then $\epsilon\phi_1 \leq u_\lambda$ and E_λ is Gâteaux-differentiable in u_λ. Consequently, for any $\phi \in X$,

$$< E'_\lambda(u_\lambda), \phi >=< u_\lambda - \lambda(\Delta_p u_\lambda + \frac{1}{u_\lambda^\delta}) - g, \phi >= 0.$$

We observe that if $\delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$ then

$$u \to u - \lambda(\Delta_p u - \frac{1}{u^\delta}) \quad \text{is monotone from } W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C} \text{ to } W^{-1,\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega). \tag{1.3}$$

Then, by the weak comparison principle, we have also that

$$u_\lambda \leq M$$

for any $M > |g|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \frac{\lambda}{|g|^\delta_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}$. Then, $u_\lambda \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let $U \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{C}$ (with suitable $0 < \alpha < 1$) be the unique positive solution (see GIACOMONI-SCHINDLER-TAKÁČ [**15**, Theorem B.1] for the existence and regularity of U) to

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{rll}
-\Delta_p u & = \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} & \text{in } \Omega,\\
u & = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega.
\end{array}
\right.
\tag{1.4}
$$

Therefore, observing that for $M' > 0$,

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{rll}
M'U - \lambda\left(\Delta_p(M'U) + \dfrac{1}{(M'U)^\delta}\right) & = M'U + \dfrac{\lambda(M'^{p-1} - M'^{-\delta})}{U^\delta} & \text{in } \Omega\\
M'U & = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega,
\end{array}
\right.
$$

and by the weak comparison principle, we get that $u_\lambda \leq M'U$ for M' large enough. Together with $\epsilon\phi_1 \leq u_\lambda$, it follows that $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$. Again using GIACOMONI-SCHINDLER-TAKÁČ [**15**, Theorem B.1], we get that $u_\lambda \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and then $u_\lambda \in C_0(\overline{\Omega})$.

We consider now the case $\delta \geq 1$. We use in this case the weak comparison principle, the existence of suitable subsolutions and supersolutions of the following approximated problem :

$$
(\mathrm{P}_\epsilon)\left\{
\begin{array}{c}
u - \lambda\left(\Delta_p u + \frac{1}{(u+\epsilon)^\delta}\right) = g \quad \text{in } \Omega,\\
u = 0 \ \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \ \ u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega.
\end{array}
\right.
$$

Using a minimization argument as in the case $\delta < 1$, we get the existence and the uniqueness of the solution to (P_ϵ), denoted u_ϵ, in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^+ \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. From the elliptic regularity theory (see LIEBERMAN [**20**]), we obtain that $u_\epsilon \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$. We now construct appropriate subsolutions and supersolutions for (P_ϵ). For $\delta = 1$, by straightforward computations we have that for $A > 0$ large enough (depending on the diameter of Ω), and for $\eta > 0$ small enough (depending on λ and g but not on ϵ)

$$\underline{u}_\epsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\eta\phi_1 + \epsilon')\left[\ln(\frac{A}{\eta\phi_1 + \epsilon'})\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} - \epsilon'\left[\ln(\frac{A}{\epsilon'})\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{1.5}$$

with $\epsilon' > 0$ satisfying $\epsilon = \epsilon'[\ln(\frac{A}{\epsilon'})]^{\frac{1}{p}}$, is a subsolution to (P_ϵ). Similarly, for $M > 0$ large enough (depending on λ and g but not on ϵ)

$$\bar{u}_\epsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} (M\phi_1 + \epsilon')\left[\ln(\frac{A}{M\phi_1 + \epsilon'})\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} - \epsilon'\left[\ln(\frac{A}{\epsilon'})\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{1.6}$$

is a supersolution to (P_ϵ) satisfying $\bar{u}_\epsilon \geq \underline{u}_\epsilon$. If $\delta > 1$, we consider the following subsolution and supersolution respectively:

$$\underline{u}_\epsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} \eta\left[(\phi_1 + \epsilon^{\frac{p-1+\delta}{p}})^{\frac{p}{p-1+\delta}} - \epsilon\right], \tag{1.7}$$

for $\eta > 0$ small enough and

$$\bar{u}_\epsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} M\left[(\phi_1 + \epsilon^{\frac{p-1+\delta}{p}})^{\frac{p}{p-1+\delta}} - \epsilon\right], \tag{1.8}$$

for $M > 0$ large enough. Since the operator $u \to -\Delta_p u - \frac{1}{(u+\epsilon)^\delta}$ is monotone from $(W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))^+$ to $W^{-1,\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)$ (see Deimling [**9**] for further details about the theory of monotone operators), we get from the weak comparison principle that

$$\underline{u}_\epsilon \leq u_\epsilon \leq \bar{u}_\epsilon. \tag{1.9}$$

Again from the weak comparison principle, we have that

$$0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2 \Rightarrow \begin{cases} u_{\epsilon_2} < u_{\epsilon_1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_{\epsilon_1} + \epsilon_1 < u_{\epsilon_2} + \epsilon_2 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

from which it follows that $(u_{\epsilon_n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence as $\epsilon_n \to 0^+$ in $C_0(\bar{\Omega})$. Then $u_{\epsilon_n} \to u$ in $C_0(\bar{\Omega})$ and by passing to the limit in (1.9) we deduce that $\underline{u} \leq u \leq \overline{u}$ where $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ are the respective subsolution and supersolution to (P) given by

$$\phi = \begin{cases} \phi_1\left(\ln(\frac{A}{\phi_1})\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } \delta = 1, \\ \phi_1^{\frac{p}{p-1+\delta}} & \text{if } \delta > 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \underline{u} = \eta\phi, \\ \overline{u} = M\phi, \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

(with A, $M > 0$ large enough and $\eta > 0$ small enough, depending on λ, g). Then it follows that $u \in \mathcal{C} \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$. Let us show that u is a weak solution to (P). Since $\delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$, we get from (1.9) and the Hardy Inequality that

$$\limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega \frac{u_{\epsilon_n}}{(u_{\epsilon_n} + \epsilon_n)^\delta}\mathrm{d}x < +\infty,$$

and consequently, by multiplying by u_{ϵ_n} the first equation of (P_ϵ) and integrating by parts, we obtain $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|u_{\epsilon_n}\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} < +\infty$. Moreover, by subtracting $(\mathrm{P}_{\epsilon_n})$ to $(\mathrm{P}_{\epsilon_m})$ and recalling the following well-know inequality for $p \geq 2$, w, v in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and suitable $C_1 > 0$,

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla w|^{p-2}\nabla w - |\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v)\nabla(w - v)\mathrm{d}x \geq C_1 \int_\Omega |\nabla(w - v)|^p \mathrm{d}x \tag{1.11}$$

and the following well-know inequality for $p < 2$, w, v in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and suitable $C_2 > 0$,
(1.12)

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla w|^{p-2}\nabla w - |\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v)\nabla(w-v)\mathrm{d}x \geq \frac{C_2\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla(w-v)|^p \mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{2}{p}}}{\left(\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla w|^p \mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^p \mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)^{2-p}},$$

we obtain

$$< -\Delta_p u_{\epsilon_n} + \Delta_p u_{\epsilon_m}, u_{\epsilon_n} - u_{\epsilon_m} > \geq \begin{cases} C_1 \|u_{\epsilon_n} - u_{\epsilon_m}\|^p_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} & \text{if } p \geq 2, \\ C_2 \frac{\|u_{\epsilon_n} - u_{\epsilon_m}\|^2_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}}{(\|u_{\epsilon_n}\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u_{\epsilon_m}\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)})^{2-p}} & \text{if } p < 2. \end{cases}$$

Then we deduce that u_{ϵ_n} is also a Cauchy sequence in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as $\epsilon_n \to 0^+$ and that $u_{\epsilon_n} \to u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Thus, it is easy to derive that u is a weak solution to (P). Finally, the uniqueness of the solution to (P) in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}$ follows from (1.3). □

We prove now Theorem 0.5.

Proof. Let $\delta \geq 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$. We give an alternative proof for existence of solutions. Let $(\Omega_k)_k$ be an increasing sequence of smooth domains such that $\Omega_k \uparrow \Omega$ (in the Hausdorff Topology) and $\frac{1}{k} \leq \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq \frac{2}{k}$, $\forall\, x \in \Omega_k$. We use the sub-solution and super-solution technique in Ω_k and pass to the limit as $k \to \infty$. For $0 < \eta < M$, let

$$\underline{u} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \eta(\phi_1)^{\frac{p}{p-1+\delta}}, \quad \bar{u} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} M(\phi_1)^{\frac{p}{p-1+\delta}}.$$

For η small enough and M large enough, $\underline{u}$ and $\bar{u}$ are respectively a subsolution and a supersolution to (P) and both belong to $\mathcal{C} \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$. By using a minimization argument in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_k)$ as in the case $\delta < 1$ (note that the term associated to $\frac{1}{u^\delta}$ in the energy functional is not singular since $\underline{u} > 0$ on $\partial\Omega_k$), there is a positive solution $v_k \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega_k)$ to

$$\begin{cases} u - \lambda(\Delta_p(u + \underline{u}) + \dfrac{1}{(u+\underline{u})^\delta}) & = g - \underline{u} \quad \text{in } \Omega_k, \\ u & = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_k. \end{cases}$$

From Lieberman [**20**], $v_k \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}_k)$ for some $\beta \in (0,1)$. Then, $u_k \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} u + \underline{u} \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}_k)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_k - \lambda(\Delta_p u_k + \dfrac{1}{u_k^\delta}) & = g \quad \text{in } \Omega_k, \\ u & = \underline{u} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_k. \end{cases}$$

and $\underline{u} \leq u_k \leq \bar{u}$ holds. From the weak comparison principle, we have that $u_k \leq u_{k+1}$ in Ω_k, and if $\tilde{u}_k \in C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ denotes the extension of u_k by $\underline{u}$ outside Ω_k, then $\underline{u} \leq \tilde{u}_k \leq \tilde{u}_{k+1} \leq \bar{u}$ and by Dini's Theorem, $\tilde{u}_k \to u$ in $C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, for every compact subset $\mathcal{K}$ of Ω and k large enough so that $\mathcal{K} \subset \Omega_k$, we have $\frac{1}{\tilde{u}_k^\delta} = \frac{1}{u_k^\delta} \leq \frac{1}{\underline{u}^\delta} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{K})$ and $\Delta_p \tilde{u}_k = \Delta_p u_k = -g + u_k - \frac{\lambda}{u_k^\delta}$ bounded in $L^\infty(\mathcal{K})$ uniformely in k. Then using local regularity results (see for instance Serrin [**24**], Tolksdorf [**27**] and [**26**], DiBenetdetto [**11**]), for k large enough we get that u_k is bounded in $C^1(\mathcal{K})$ and then converges to u in $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{K})$. Then $\underline{u} \leq u \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \lim\limits_{k\to\infty} u_k \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ and satisfies

(P) in the sense of distributions. Let us show that $u \notin W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. For that, we argue by contradiction: assume that $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Then, from the equation in (P), we get that $\frac{1}{u^\delta} \in W^{-1,\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)$. Thus, $\int_\Omega \bar{u}^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x \le \int_\Omega u^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x < +\infty$ which contradicts the definition of $\bar{u}$. The proof of Theorem 0.5 is now complete. □

2. Proof of Theorem 0.7 and Proposition 0.1

Using Theorem 0.4 and a time discretization method, we prove Theorem 0.7.

Proof. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $n \ge 2$ and $\Delta_t = \frac{T}{N}$. For $0 \le n \le N$, we define $t_n \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} n\Delta_t$, $h^n(\cdot) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\Delta_t}\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} h(\tau,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}\tau \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and the function $h_{\Delta_t} \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ as follows:

$$h_{\Delta_t}(t) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} h^n, \quad \forall t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n),\ \forall\, n \in \{1,\dots,N\}.$$

Notice that we have for all $1 < q < +\infty$:

$$\|h_{\Delta_t}\|_{L^q(Q_T)} \le (T|\Omega|)^{\frac{1}{q}}\|h\|_\infty, \tag{2.1}$$

$$h_{\Delta_t} \to h \text{ in } L^q(Q_T). \tag{2.2}$$

From Theorem 0.4 (with $\lambda = \Delta_t$, $g = \Delta_t h^n + u^{n-1} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$), we define by iteration $u^n \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}$ with the following scheme:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{\Delta_t} - \Delta_p u^n - \dfrac{1}{(u^n)^\delta} & = h^n \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad u^n & = 0 \quad\ \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

and $u^0 = u_0 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}$. Then, defining functions u_{Δ_t}, $\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}$ by: for all $n \in \{1,\dots,N\}$,

$$\forall t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n), \begin{cases} u_{\Delta_t}(t) & \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} u^n, \\ \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}(t) & \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \dfrac{(t - t_{n-1})}{\Delta_t}(u^n - u^{n-1}) + u^{n-1}, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

we have that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}}{\partial t} - \Delta_p u_{\Delta_t} - \frac{1}{{u_{\Delta_t}}^\delta} = h_{\Delta_t} \in L^\infty(Q_T). \tag{2.5}$$

Using energy estimates, we first establish some apriori estimates for u_{Δ_t} and $\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}$ independent of Δ_t. Precisely, multiplying (2.3) by $\Delta_t u^n$ and summing from $n = 1$ to $N' \le N$, we get for $\epsilon > 0$ small, by the Young Inequality and (2.1),

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N'}\int_\Omega (u^n - u^{n-1})u^n\mathrm{d}x + \Delta_t\left[\sum_{n=1}^{N'}\|u^n\|^p_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} - \sum_{n=1}^{N'}\int_\Omega (u^n)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x\right] \le$$

$$C(\epsilon)T|\Omega|\|h\|_\infty^{\frac{p}{p-1}} + \epsilon\Delta_t\sum_{n=1}^{N'}\|u^n\|^p_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}. \tag{2.6}$$

In addition,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N'}\int_\Omega (u^n - u^{n-1})u^n\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{N'}\int_\Omega (|u^n - u^{n-1}|^2 + |u^n|^2 - |u^{n-1}|^2)\mathrm{d}x =$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{N'}\int_\Omega |u^n - u^{n-1}|^2\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u^{N'}|^2\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_0|^2\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2.7}$$

Next, we estimate the singular term in the above expression. For that, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 0.4, we can prove the existence of $\underline{u}$, $\bar{u} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}$ such that $\underline{u} \leq u_0 \leq \bar{u}$ (since $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}$) and such that

$$-\Delta_p \underline{u} - \frac{1}{\underline{u}^\delta} \leq -\|h\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$-\Delta_p \bar{u} - \frac{1}{\bar{u}^\delta} \geq \|h\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Indeed, if $\delta < 1$ choose $\underline{u} = \eta\phi_1$ and $\overline{u} = MU$ with U solution of (1.4) and if $\delta \geq 1$ choose $\underline{u}$, $\overline{u}$ as in (1.10), where $A > 0$, $M > 0$ are large enough and $\eta > 0$ is small enough. Note that A, M, η depend on $\|h\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)}$. Then iterating the application of the weak comparison principle, we obtain that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\underline{u} \leq u^n \leq \bar{u}$ which implies that

$$\underline{u} \leq u_{\Delta_t},\, \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \leq \bar{u}. \tag{2.8}$$

Therefore, since $\delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$,

$$\Delta_t \sum_{n=1}^{N'} \int_\Omega (u^n)^{1-\delta} \mathrm{d}x \leq \begin{cases} T\displaystyle\int_\Omega \bar{u}^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x < +\infty & \text{if } \delta \leq 1, \\ T\displaystyle\int_\Omega \underline{u}^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x < +\infty & \text{if } \delta > 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

Gathering the (2.6), (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9), we get that u_{Δ_t}, $\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \in \mathcal{C}$ uniformly and are bounded in $L^p(0,T;\, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\, L^\infty(\Omega))$. We now use a second energy estimate. Multiplying (2.3) by $u^n - u^{n-1}$ and summing from $n = 1$ to $N' \leq N$, we get by the Young Inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_t \sum_{n=1}^{N'} \int_\Omega \Big(\frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{\Delta_t}\Big)^2 \mathrm{d}x \quad &+ \quad \sum_{n=1}^{N'} \int_\Omega |\nabla u^n|^{p-2} \nabla u^n \cdot \nabla(u^n - u^{n-1}) \mathrm{d}x \\ - \sum_{n=1}^{N'} \int_\Omega \frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{(u^n)^\delta} \mathrm{d}x \quad &\leq \quad \frac{\Delta_t}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{N'} \left[\int_\Omega (h^n)^2 \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \Big(\frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{\Delta_t}\Big)^2 \mathrm{d}x \right]\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Delta_t}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{N'} \int_\Omega \Big(\frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{\Delta_t}\Big)^2 \mathrm{d}x \quad &+ \quad \sum_{n=1}^{N'} \int_\Omega |\nabla u^n|^{p-2} \nabla u^n \cdot \nabla(u^n - u^{n-1}) \mathrm{d}x \\ &- \quad \sum_{n=1}^{N'} \int_\Omega \frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{(u^n)^\delta} \mathrm{d}x \leq |\Omega| \frac{T}{2} \|h\|^2_{L^\infty(Q_T)}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

From the convexity of the terms $\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \mathrm{d}x$ and $-\frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_\Omega u^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x$ we derive the following estimates:

(2.12)

$$\frac{1}{p}\left[\int_\Omega |\nabla u^n|^p \mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega |\nabla u^{n-1}|^p \mathrm{d}x\right] \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u^n|^{p-2} \nabla u^n \nabla(u^n - u^{n-1}) \mathrm{d}x,$$

$$\frac{1}{1-\delta}\left[\int_\Omega (u^{n-1})^{1-\delta} \mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega (u^n)^{1-\delta} \mathrm{d}x\right] \leq -\int_\Omega \frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{(u^n)^\delta} \mathrm{d}x.$$

Therefore, gathering the estimates (2.11) and (2.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Delta_t}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{N'}\int_\Omega \Big(\frac{u^n-u^{n-1}}{\Delta_t}\Big)^2 \mathrm{d}x \quad &+ \quad \frac{1}{p}\left[\int_\Omega |\nabla u^{N'}|^p \mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^p \mathrm{d}x\right] + \\ \frac{1}{1-\delta}\left[\int_\Omega (u_0)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x \quad - \right. &\left. \int_\Omega (u^{N'})^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x\right] \leq |\Omega|\frac{T}{2}\|h\|^2_{L^\infty(Q_T)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

The above expression together with $\int_\Omega (u^n)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x \leq \max\left\{\int_\Omega (\bar{u})^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x,\, \int_\Omega (\underline{u})^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x\right\}$ yields

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}}{\partial t} \text{ is bounded in } L^2(Q_T) \text{ uniformly in } \Delta_t, \tag{2.14}$$

$$u_{\Delta_t},\, \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \text{ are bounded in } L^\infty(0,T;\, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)) \text{ uniformly in } \Delta_t. \tag{2.15}$$

Furthermore, from above there exists $C > 0$ independent of Δ_t such that

$$\|u_{\Delta_t} - \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;\,L^2(\Omega))} \leq \max_{n\in\{1,\cdot\cdot,N\}} \|u^n - u^{n-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(\Delta_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.16}$$

Therefore, taking $N \to \infty$ (which implies that $\Delta_t \to 0^+$), and up to a subsequence, we get from (2.14) and (2.15) that there exists $u, v \in L^\infty(0,T;\, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega))$ such that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \in L^2(Q_T)$, $u,\, v \in \mathcal{C}$ uniformly and as $\Delta_t \to 0^+$,

$$\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} u \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0,T;\, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)), \tag{2.17}$$

$$u_{\Delta_t} \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} v \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0,T;\, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)), \tag{2.18}$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}}{\partial t} \rightharpoonup \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \quad \text{in } L^2(Q_T). \tag{2.19}$$

From (2.16), it follows that $u \equiv v$. Moreover, from (2.8), it follows that $\underline{u} \leq u \leq \bar{u}$. Therefore, $u \in \mathbf{V}(Q_T)$.

Next, let us prove that u satisfies (in the sense of Definition 0.2) the first equation in (S_t). Using the boundedness of $\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}}{\partial t}$ in $L^2(Q_T)$ given by (2.14), we first get that $\{\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}\}_{\Delta_t}$ is equicontinuous in $C(0,T;\, L^q(\Omega))$ for $1 \leq q \leq 2$, and thus with $\underline{u} \leq \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \leq \overline{u}$ and the interpolation inequality $\|\cdot\|_r \leq \|\cdot\|_\infty^\alpha \|\cdot\|_2^{1-\alpha}$, $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{\alpha}{\infty} + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$, we obtain that $\{\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}\}_{\Delta_t}$ is equicontinuous in $C(0,T;\, L^q(\Omega))$ for any $1 < q < +\infty$. Moreover, since $\{\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}\}_{\Delta_t}$ is a bounded family of $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ which is compactely embedded in $L^q(\Omega)$ for $1 < q < \frac{\mathrm{N}p}{\mathrm{N}-p}$, and from Ascoli-Arzela Theorem, and using again the interpolation inequality, we get as $\Delta_t \to 0^+$ that up to a subsequence

$$\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \to u \quad \text{in } C(0,T;\, L^q(\Omega)),\ \forall\, q > 1, \tag{2.20}$$

and then, from (2.16) (with the interpolation inequality for $q > 2$), it follows that

$$u_{\Delta_t} \to u \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0,T;\, L^q(\Omega)),\ \forall\, q > 1 \tag{2.21}$$

as $\Delta_t \to 0^+$. Thus, multiplying (2.5) by $(u_{\Delta_t} - u)$ and using (2.20)-(2.21), we get by straightforward calculations:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \int_\Omega \left[\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\right](\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} - u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \quad &- \quad \int_0^T < \Delta_p u_{\Delta_t}, u_{\Delta_t} - u > \mathrm{d}t \\ - \int_0^T \int_\Omega u_{\Delta_t}^{-\delta}(u_{\Delta_t} - u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \quad &= \quad \int_0^T \int_\Omega h_{\Delta_t}(u_{\Delta_t} - u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t + o_{\Delta_t}(1).\end{aligned}$$

From (2.8) and (2.20), we have that

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega u_{\Delta_t}^{-\delta}(u_{\Delta_t} - u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t = o_{\Delta_t}(1),$$

and from (2.1) and (2.20) we have

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega h_{\Delta_t}(u_{\Delta_t} - u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t = o_{\Delta_t}(1).$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} - u|^2(T)\mathrm{d}x - \int_0^T < \Delta_p u_{\Delta_t} - \Delta_p u, u_{\Delta_t} - u > \mathrm{d}t = o_{\Delta_t}(1).$$

Therefore, using (2.21), $u \not\equiv 0$ and the inequality (1.11) with $w = u_{\Delta_t}(t)$ and $v = u(t)$ we obtain that $u_{\Delta_t} \to u$ in $L^p(0,T; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ and

$$-\Delta_p u_{\Delta_t} \to -\Delta_p u \quad \text{in } L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(0,T; W^{-1,\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)). \tag{2.22}$$

Moreover, from (2.8), for any $\phi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$

$$\left|\int_\Omega \frac{\phi}{(u_{\Delta_t})^\delta}\mathrm{d}x\right| \leq \int_\Omega \frac{|\phi|}{(\underline{u})^\delta}\mathrm{d}x \leq \left(\int_\Omega \left(\frac{d(x)}{(\underline{u})^\delta}\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \times \left(\int_\Omega \left(\frac{|\phi|}{d(x)}\right)^p \mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

and since $\delta < 2 + \frac{1}{p-1}$

$$\int_\Omega \left(\frac{d(x)}{\underline{u}^\delta}\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} < +\infty.$$

Then, from the Hardy Inequality and from the Lebesgue Theorem, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{(u_{\Delta_t})^\delta} \to \frac{1}{u^\delta} \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0,T; W^{-1,\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)). \tag{2.23}$$

Therefore, from (2.2), (2.20), (2.21), (2.22), (2.23) we deduce that $u \in \mathbf{V}(Q_T)$ satisfies (P_t).

Let us now show that u is the unique weak solution such that $u(t) \in \mathcal{C}$, $\forall\, t \in [0,T]$. Assume that there exists $v \not\equiv u$ a weak solution to (P_t) satisfying $v(t) \in \mathcal{C}$, $\forall\, t \in [0,T]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \int_\Omega \frac{\partial(u-v)}{\partial t}(u-v)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \quad &- \quad \int_0^T < \Delta_p u - \Delta_p v, u - v > \mathrm{d}t \\ &- \quad \int_0^T \int_\Omega (u^{-\delta} - v^{-\delta})(u-v)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t = 0.\end{aligned}$$

The above equality together with $u(0) = v(0)$ imply $u \equiv v$.

To complete the proof of Theorem 0.7, let us prove $u \in C([0,T]; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ and (0.3). First, we observe that since $u \in C([0,T], L^2(\Omega))$ and $u \in L^\infty(0,T; W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$, it follows that $u : t \in [0,T] \to W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is weakly continuous and then that $u(t_0) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $\|u(t_0)\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq \liminf_{t\to t_0} \|u(t)\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}$ for all $t_0 \in [0,T]$. From (2.2), (2.13) (with $\sum_{n=N''}^{N'}$ for $1 \leq N'' \leq N'$ instead of $\sum_{n=1}^{N'}$), (2.16) and (2.23), it follows that u satisfies for any $t \in [t_0, T]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t})^2\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{p}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(t)|^p\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_{\Omega}u(t)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}h\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s +\\ \frac{1}{p}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(t_0)|^p\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_{\Omega}u(t_0)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}\tag{2.24}$$

From (2.24) and Lebesgue Theorem, it follows that

$$\limsup_{t\to t_0^+}\|u(t)\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq \|u(t_0)\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}$$

and then $u(t) \to u(t_0)$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as $t \to t_0{}^+$ which implies that u is right--continuous on $[0, T]$. Let $t > t_0$. Let us now prove the left-continuity. Let $0 < k \leq t - t_0$. Multiplying (0.2) by $\tau_k(u)(s) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{u(s+k)-u(s)}{k}$ and integrating over $(t_0, t) \times \Omega$, we get, using convexity arguments, that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\tau_k(u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{kp}\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}(|\nabla u(s+k)|^p - |\nabla u(s)|^p)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s\\ &- \frac{1}{(1-\delta)k}\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}(u^{1-\delta}(s+k) - u^{1-\delta}(s))\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \geq \int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}h\tau_k(u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\tau_k(u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{kp}(\int_{t}^{t+k}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(s)|^p\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s - \int_{t_0}^{t_0+k}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(s)|^p\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s)\\ &-\frac{1}{(1-\delta)k}(\int_{t}^{t+k}\int_{\Omega}(u^{1-\delta}(s)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s - \int_{t_0}^{t_0+k}u^{1-\delta}(s))\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s) \geq \int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}h\tau_k(u)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

Since u is right-continuous in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and by Lebesgue theorem, we get as $k \to 0^+$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{k}\int_{t}^{t+k}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(s)|^p\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s &\to \int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(t)|^p\mathrm{d}x,\\ \frac{1}{k}\int_{t_0}^{t_0+k}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(s)|^p\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s &\to \int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(t_0)|^p\mathrm{d}x,\\ \frac{1}{k}\int_{t}^{t+k}\int_{\Omega}u^{1-\delta}(s)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s &\to \int_{\Omega}u^{1-\delta}(t)\mathrm{d}x,\\ \frac{1}{k}\int_{t_0}^{t_0+k}\int_{\Omega}u^{1-\delta}(s))\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s &\to \int_{\Omega}u(t_0)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

From the above estimates, we get as $k \to 0^+$

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t})^2\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{p}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(t)|^p\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_{\Omega}u(t)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x \geq\\ &\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{\Omega}h\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{p}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(t_0)|^p\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{1-\delta}\int_{\Omega}u(t_0)^{1-\delta}\mathrm{d}x,\end{aligned}$$

which implies together with (2.24) that the above inequality is in fact an equality. Then together with the fact that $t \to \int_{\Omega}u^{1-\delta}(t)\mathrm{d}x$ is continuous, it follows that $u \in C([0, T], W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$. Finally (0.3) is obtained by setting $t_0 = 0$. □

We end this section by proving proposition 0.1.

Proof. Assume that $u_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, where A and $\mathcal{D}(A)$ are defined in (0.4). From (1.3), A is m-accretive in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Indeed, for $f, g \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\lambda > 0$, set u and $v \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ (given by Theorem 0.4) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} u - \lambda A u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ v - \lambda A v = g \quad \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

From (2.25) and defining $w \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left(u - v - \|f-g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)^+$, we get that

$$\int_\Omega w^2 \mathrm{d}x + \lambda < Au - Av, w >_{W^{-1,p'}(\Omega), W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq 0.$$

From (1.11) or (1.12) it follows that $u - v \leq \|f-g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ and reversing the roles of u and v, we get that $\|u-v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|f-g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. Then Proposition 0.1 can be obtained from [**4**, Chap.4, Th. 4.2 and Th. 4.4]. However, in order to be complete and self-contained, let us briefly explain the argument. In the following, $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ stands for the norm of $L^\infty(\Omega)$. For $z \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and r, k in $L^\infty(Q_T)$ let define

$$\varphi(t,s) = \|r(t) - k(s)\|_\infty \quad (t,s) \in [0,T] \times [0,T],$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b(t,r,k) \;&=\; \|u_0 - z\|_\infty + \|v_0 - z\|_\infty + |t|\|Az\|_\infty \\ &+ \int_0^{t^+} \|r(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^{t^-} \|k(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau, \; t \in [-T,T], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Psi(t,s) = b(t-s,r,k) + \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_0^s \varphi(t-s+\tau,\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T, \\ \displaystyle\int_0^t \varphi(\tau, s-t+\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq s \leq T, \end{cases}$$

the solution of

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} \dfrac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t}(t,s) + \dfrac{\partial \Psi}{\partial s}(t,s) & = & \varphi(t,s) & (t,s) \in [0,T] \times [0,T], \\ \Psi(t,0) & = & b(t,r,k) & t \in [0,T], \\ \Psi(0,s) & = & b(-s,r,k) & s \in [0,T]. \end{array} \right. \tag{2.26}$$

Moreover, let denote by (u_ϵ^n) the solution of (2.3) with $\Delta_t = \epsilon$, $h = r$, $r^n = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{(n-1)\epsilon}^{n\epsilon} r(\tau,\cdot)d\tau$ and (u_η^n) the solution of (2.3) with $\Delta_t = \eta$, $h = k$, $k^n = \frac{1}{\eta}\int_{(n-1)\eta}^{n\eta} k(\tau,\cdot)d\tau$ respectively. For $(n,m) \in \mathbb{N}^*$ elementary calculations leads to

$$\begin{aligned} u_\epsilon^n - u_\eta^m + \frac{\epsilon\eta}{\epsilon+\eta}(Au_\epsilon^n - Au_\eta^m) \;&=\; \frac{\eta}{\epsilon+\eta}(u_\epsilon^{n-1} - u_\eta^m) \\ + \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon+\eta}(u_\epsilon^n - u_\eta^{m-1}) \;&+\; \frac{\epsilon\eta}{\epsilon+\eta}(r^n - k^m), \end{aligned}$$

and since A is m-accretive in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ we first verify that $\Phi_{n,m}^{\epsilon,\eta} = \|u_\epsilon^n - u_\eta^m\|_\infty$ obeys

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{n,m}^{\epsilon,\eta} \;&\leq\; \frac{\eta}{\epsilon+\eta}\Phi_{n-1,m}^{\epsilon,\eta} + \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon+\eta}\Phi_{n,m-1}^{\epsilon,\eta} + \frac{\epsilon\eta}{\epsilon+\eta}\|r^n - k^m\|_\infty, \\ \Phi_{n,0}^{\epsilon,\eta} \;&\leq\; b(t_n, r_\epsilon, k_\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{0,m}^{\epsilon,\eta} \leq b(-s_m, r_\epsilon, k_\eta), \end{aligned}$$

and thus, with an easy inductive argument, that $\Phi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{n,m} \leq \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{n,m}$ where $\Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{n,m}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{n,m} &= \frac{\eta}{\epsilon+\eta}\Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{n-1,m} + \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon+\eta}\Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{n,m-1} + \frac{\epsilon\eta}{\epsilon+\eta}\|h^n_\epsilon - h^m_\eta\|_\infty, \\ \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{n,0} &= b(t_n, r_\epsilon, k_\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{0,m} = b(-s_m, r_\epsilon, k_\eta). \end{aligned}$$

For $(t,s) \in (t_{n-1}, t_n) \times (s_{m-1}, s_m)$ let set $\varphi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,s) = \|r_\epsilon(t) - k_\eta(s)\|_\infty$ and $\Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,s) = \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}_{n,m}$, $b_{\epsilon,\eta}(t,r,k) = b(t_n, r_\epsilon, k_\eta)$ and $b_{\epsilon,\eta}(-s,r,k) = b(-s_m, r_\epsilon, k_\eta)$. Then $\Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}$ satisfies the following discrete version of (2.26):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,s) - \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t-\epsilon,s)}{\epsilon} + \frac{\Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,s) - \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,s-\eta)}{\eta} &= \varphi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,s), \\ \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,0) = b_{\epsilon,\eta}(t,r,k) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}(0,s) &= b_{\epsilon,\eta}(s,r,k), \end{aligned}$$

and from $b_{\epsilon,\eta}(\cdot,r,k) \to b(\cdot,r,k)$ in $L^\infty([0,T])$ and $\varphi^{\epsilon,\eta} \to \varphi$ in $L^\infty([0,T]\times[0,T])$ we deduce that $\rho_{\epsilon,\eta} = \|\Psi^{\epsilon,\eta} - \Psi\|_{L^\infty([0,T]\times[0,T])} \to 0$ as $(\epsilon,\eta) \to 0$ (see for instance [**4**, Chap.4, Lemma 4.3]). Then from

$$\|u_\epsilon(t) - u_\eta(s)\|_\infty = \Phi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,s) \leq \Psi^{\epsilon,\eta}(t,s) \leq \Psi(t,s) + \rho_{\epsilon,\eta}, \tag{2.27}$$

we obtain with $t = s$, $r = k = h$, $v_0 = u_0$:

$$\|u_\epsilon(t) - u_\eta(t)\|_\infty \leq 2\|u_0 - z\|_\infty + \rho_{\epsilon,\eta},$$

and since z can be chosen in $\mathcal{D}(A)$ arbitrary close to u_0, we deduce that u_ϵ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(Q_T)$ and then that $u_\epsilon \to u$ in $L^\infty(Q_T)$. Thus, passing to the limit in (2.27) with $r = k = h$, $v_0 = u_0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t) - u(s)\|_\infty &\leq 2\|u_0 - z\|_\infty + |t-s|\|Az\|_\infty + \int_0^{|t-s|} \|h(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau \\ &+ \int_0^{\max(t,s)} \|h(|t-s| + \tau) - h(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau, \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

which, together with the density $\mathcal{D}(A)$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $h \in L^1(0,T;L^\infty(\Omega))$, yields $u \in C([0,T];L^\infty(\Omega))$. Analogously, from (2.27) with $\varepsilon = \eta = \Delta_t$, $r = k = h$, $v_0 = u_0$ and $t = s + \Delta_t$ we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\Delta_t}(t) - \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}(t)\|_\infty &\leq 2\|u_{\Delta_t}(t) - u_{\Delta_t}(t-\Delta_t)\|_\infty \\ &\leq 4\|u_0 - z\|_\infty + 2\Delta_t\|Az\|_\infty + 2\int_0^{\Delta_t} \|h(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau \\ &+ 2\int_0^t \|h(\Delta_t + \tau) - h(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the limit $\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \to u$ in $C([0,T];L^\infty(\Omega))$ as $\Delta_t \to 0^+$. Note that since $\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \in C([0,T];C_0(\overline{\Omega}))$, the uniform limit u belongs to $C([0,T];C_0(\overline{\Omega}))$. Moreover, passing to the limit in (2.27) with $t = s$ we obtain

$$\|u(t) - v(t)\|_\infty \leq \|u_0 - z\|_\infty + \|v_0 - z\|_\infty + \int_0^t \|r(\tau) - k(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau,$$

and (0.5) follows because we can choose z arbitrary close to v_0. Finally, if $Au_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $h \in W^{1,1}(0,T;L^\infty(\Omega))$ and if we assume (without loss of generality) that $t > s$ then with $z = v_0 = u(t-s)$ and $(r,k) = (h, h(\cdot + t - s))$ in the last above inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u(t)-u(s)\|_\infty &\leq \|u_0 - u(t-s)\|_\infty + \int_0^s \|h(\tau) - h(\tau+t-s)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\leq \int_0^{t-s} \|Au_0 - h(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau + \int_0^s \|h(\tau) - h(\tau+t-s)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\leq (t-s)\|Au_0 - h(0)\|_\infty + \int_0^{t-s} \|h(0) - h(\tau)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&+ \int_0^s \|h(\tau) - h(\tau+t-s)\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\leq (t-s)\left((\|Au_0 - h(0)\|_\infty + \int_0^T \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}h(\tau)}{\mathrm{d}t} \right\|_\infty \mathrm{d}\tau \right). \qquad (2.29)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the second above inequality is obtained from (0.5) with $v = u_0$, $k = Au_0$ and the last above inequality is obtained from $h(\tau) - h(\tau+t-s) = \int_\tau^{\tau+t-s} \frac{\mathrm{d}h(\tau)}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathrm{d}\sigma$ together with Fubini's Theorem. Dividing the expression (2.29) by $|t-s|$, we get that u is a Lipschitz function and since $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \in L^2(Q_T)$, passing to the limit $|t-s| \to 0$ we obtain that $\frac{u(t)-u(s)}{t-s} \to \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ as $s \to t$ weakly in $L^2(Q_T)$ and *-weakly in $L^\infty(Q_T)$. Furthermore,

$$\left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right\|_\infty \leq \liminf_{s \to t} \frac{\|u(t) - u(s)\|_\infty}{|t-s|}.$$

Therefore, we get $u \in W^{1,\infty}(0,T; L^\infty(\Omega))$ as well as inequality (0.6). $\square$

3. Proofs of Theorems 0.6, 0.10, 0.12 and of Proposition 0.2

We start this section by the proof of Theorem 0.6. We use the following preliminary result which gives the validity of the weak comparison principle for sub-homogeneous problems and then forces uniqueness of solutions.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $1 < r < +\infty$, $g : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a Caratheodory function bounded below such that* $\frac{g(x,s)}{s^{r-1}}$ *is a decreasing function in* $\mathbb{R}^+$ *for a.e.* $x \in \Omega$. *Let* $u \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$, $v \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ *satisfy* $u > 0$, $v > 0$ *in* Ω, $\int_\Omega u^{1-\delta}\,\mathrm{d}x < +\infty$, $\int_\Omega v^{1-\delta}\,\mathrm{d}x < +\infty$ *and*

$$-\Delta_r u \leq \frac{1}{u^\delta} + g(x,u) \text{ weakly in } W^{-1,\frac{r}{r-1}}(\Omega)$$

and

$$-\Delta_r v \geq \frac{1}{v^\delta} + g(x,v) \text{ weakly in } W^{-1,\frac{r}{r-1}}(\Omega).$$

Suppose in addition that there exists a positive function $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ *and positive constants* c, C *such that* $cu_0 \leq u, v \leq Cu_0$ *and*

$$\int_\Omega |g(x,cu_0)|u_0 \mathrm{d}x < +\infty, \qquad \int_\Omega |g(x,Cu_0)|u_0 \mathrm{d}x < +\infty. \qquad (3.1)$$

Then, $u \leq v$.

Proof. First, for $\epsilon > 0$, we set $u_\epsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} u + \epsilon$ and $v_\epsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} v + \epsilon$. Following some ideas in Lindqvist [**21**] (see also Drábek-Hernández [**12**]) we use the Diáz-Saa

inequality (see DIÁZ-SAA [**10**]) in the following way:
Let

$$\phi \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{u_\epsilon^r - v_\epsilon^r}{u_\epsilon^{r-1}} \text{ and } \psi \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{v_\epsilon^r - u_\epsilon^r}{v_\epsilon^{r-1}}.$$

Setting $\Omega^+ = \{x \in \Omega | u(x) > v(x)\}$, we have that $\phi \geq 0$ and $\psi \leq 0$ in Ω^+ and

$$\int_{\Omega^+} |\nabla u|^{r-2}\nabla u \nabla\phi \,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_{\Omega^+} \frac{\phi}{u^\delta}\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^+} g(x,u)\phi\,\mathrm{d}x < +\infty,$$

$$\int_{\Omega^+} |\nabla v|^{r-2}\nabla v \nabla\psi \,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_{\Omega^+} \frac{\psi}{v^\delta}\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^+} g(x,v)\psi\,\mathrm{d}x < +\infty.$$

Since

$$\nabla\phi = \left[1 + (r-1)\left(\frac{u_\epsilon}{v_\epsilon}\right)^r\right]\nabla u - r\left(\frac{v_\epsilon}{u_\epsilon}\right)^{r-1}\nabla v$$

and

$$\nabla\psi = \left[1 + (r-1)\left(\frac{v_\epsilon}{u_\epsilon}\right)^r\right]\nabla v - r\left(\frac{u_\epsilon}{v_\epsilon}\right)^{r-1}\nabla u,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega^+} |\nabla u|^{r-2}\nabla u\nabla\phi\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^+} |\nabla v|^{r-2}\nabla v\nabla\psi\,\mathrm{d}x = \\
&\int_{\Omega^+} \left(|\nabla u_\epsilon|^r\left[1 + (r-1)\left(\frac{v_\epsilon}{u_\epsilon}\right)^r\right] + |\nabla v_\epsilon|^r\left[1 + (r-1)\left(\frac{u_\epsilon}{v_\epsilon}\right)^r\right]\right)\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_{\Omega^+} (u_\epsilon^r - v_\epsilon^r)(|\nabla \log u_\epsilon|^r - |\nabla \log v_\epsilon|^r)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&- \int_{\Omega^+} r v_\epsilon^r |\nabla \log u_\epsilon|^{r-2}\nabla\log u_\epsilon(\nabla\log v_\epsilon - \nabla\log u_\epsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&- \int_{\Omega^+} r u_\epsilon^r |\nabla \log v_\epsilon|^{r-2}\nabla\log v_\epsilon(\nabla\log u_\epsilon - \nabla\log v_\epsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned}$$

If $r \geq 2$, then using the following well-known inequality

$$|w_2|^r \geq |w_1|^r + r|w_1|^{r-2}w_1(w_2 - w_1) + \frac{|w_2 - w_1|^r}{2^{r-1}-1},$$

for all points w_1 and $w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{N}}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega^+} |\nabla u|^{r-2}\nabla u\nabla\phi\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^+} |\nabla v|^{r-2}\nabla v\nabla\psi\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\geq \int_{\Omega^+} (u_\epsilon^r - v_\epsilon^r)(|\nabla \log u_\epsilon|^r - |\nabla \log v_\epsilon|^r)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&+ \int_{\Omega^+} \left(v_\epsilon^r(|\nabla\log u_\epsilon|^r - |\nabla\log v_\epsilon|^r) + \frac{|\nabla\log v_\epsilon - \nabla\log u_\epsilon|^r}{2^{r-1}-1}v_\epsilon^r\right)\mathrm{d}x \\
&+ \int_{\Omega^+} \left(u_\epsilon^r(|\nabla\log v_\epsilon|^r - |\nabla\log u_\epsilon|^r) + \frac{|\nabla\log u_\epsilon - \nabla\log v_\epsilon|^r}{2^{r-1}-1}u_\epsilon^r\right)\mathrm{d}x \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2^{r-1}-1}\int_{\Omega^+} |\nabla\log v_\epsilon - \nabla\log u_\epsilon|^r(v_\epsilon^r + u_\epsilon^r)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \frac{1}{2^{r-1}-1}\int_{\Omega^+} |u_\epsilon\nabla v_\epsilon - v_\epsilon\nabla u_\epsilon|^r\left(\frac{1}{u_\epsilon^r} + \frac{1}{v_\epsilon^r}\right)\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned}$$

If $1 < r < 2$ then using the following inequality (with some suitable $C(r) > 0$)

$$|w_2|^r \geq |w_1|^r + r|w_1|^{r-2}w_1(w_2 - w_1) + C(r)\frac{|w_2 - w_1|^2}{(|w_1| + |w_2|)^{2-r}},$$

for all points w_1 and $w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{N}}$, the last term of the above inequality dealing with $r \geq 2$ is replaced by the following term

$$\begin{aligned} &C(r)\int_{\Omega^+} \frac{|\nabla \log v_\epsilon - \nabla \log u_\epsilon|^2}{(|\nabla \log v_\epsilon| + |\nabla \log u_\epsilon|)^{2-r}}(v_\epsilon^r + u_\epsilon^r)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= C(r)\int_{\Omega^+} (\frac{1}{u_\epsilon^r} + \frac{1}{v_\epsilon^r})\frac{|u_\epsilon \nabla v_\epsilon - v_\epsilon \nabla u_\epsilon|^2}{(u_\epsilon|\nabla v_\epsilon| + v_\epsilon|\nabla u_\epsilon|)^{2-r}}\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

In the right hand side, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega^+} \left(\frac{1}{u^\delta} + g(x,u)\right)\phi\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^+} \left(\frac{1}{v^\delta} + g(x,v)\right)\psi\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \\ &\int_{\Omega^+} \left[\frac{g(x,u)}{u^{r-1}}\left(\frac{u}{u_\epsilon}\right)^{r-1} - \frac{g(x,v)}{v^{r-1}}\left(\frac{v}{v_\epsilon}\right)^{r-1}\right](u_\epsilon^r - v_\epsilon^r)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $\frac{u}{u_\epsilon} \to 1$, $\frac{v}{v_\epsilon} \to 1$ as $\epsilon \to 0^+$ a.e. in Ω, we get from (3.1) and the Lebesgue Theorem

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \int_{\Omega^+} (g(x,u)\phi + g(x,v)\psi)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq 0.$$

By Fatou lemma and using the above estimates, we obtain that $|u\nabla v - v\nabla u| = 0$ a.e. in Ω^+ from which we get that on each connected component set $\mathcal{O}$ of Ω^+, there exists $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u = kv$ in $\mathcal{O}$. From

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla u|^r\,\mathrm{d}x = k^r \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla v|^r\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_{\mathcal{O}} (k^{1-\delta}v^{1-\delta} + g(x,kv)kv)\,\mathrm{d}x, \\ &k^r \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\nabla v|^r\,\mathrm{d}x \geq k^r \int_{\mathcal{O}} (v^{1-\delta} + g(x,v)v)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq \int_{\mathcal{O}} (k^r v^{1-\delta} + g(x,kv)kv)\,\mathrm{d}x \end{aligned}$$

we get $k \leq 1$ which implies that $u \leq v$ in Ω^+ and from the definition of Ω^+, $u \leq v$ in Ω. □

We now prove Theorem 0.6.

PROOF. For $0 < \alpha_f < \ell < \lambda_1(\Omega)$, $A > 0$ large enough and $0 < \eta < M$ let define:

$$\phi = \begin{cases} V & \text{if } \delta < 1, \\ \phi_1 \left(\ln(\frac{A}{\phi_1})\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } \delta = 1, \\ \phi_1^{\frac{p}{p-1+\delta}} & \text{if } \delta > 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{u} = \eta\phi, \tag{3.2}$$

with V a positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u &= \ell u^{p-1} + \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The existence of V follows from similar minimization and cut-off arguments given in GIACOMONI-SCHINDLER-TAKÁČ [**15**, proof of Lemma 3.3, p. 126]. Note that from $\ell < \lambda_1(\Omega)$, the associated energy functional is coercive and weakly lower semicontinuous in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and from Lemma A.2 in [**15**] Gâteaux-differentiable in

$W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. From Lemma A.6 and Theorem B.1 in [**15**] and since $\delta < 1$, $V \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$.

$$\overline{u} = \begin{cases} MV \quad if\ \delta < 1 \\ M\phi_1(\ln(\frac{A}{\phi_1})^{\frac{1}{p}}) \quad if\ \delta = 1 \\ M(\phi_1 + \phi) \quad if\ \delta > 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

We verify that $\underline{u} \in \mathcal{C}$, $\overline{u} \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $L > 0$ such that $-L \leq f(x,s) \leq \ell s^{p-1} + L$. We verify that for $M > 0$ large enough for $\eta > 0$ small enough we have

$$-\Delta_p \underline{u} - \frac{1}{\underline{u}^\delta} \leq -L \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \underline{u} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

and

$$-\Delta_p \overline{u} - \frac{1}{\overline{u}^\delta} \geq \ell \overline{u}^{p-1} + L \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \overline{u} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

We distinguish between the following two cases: the case where $\delta < 1$ and the case where $\delta \geq 1$. In the first case, the solution $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ to (Q) can be obtained as a global minimizer in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ of the functional E defined below at $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$:

$$E(v) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^p \,\mathrm{dx} - \int_\Omega G(x,v)\,\mathrm{dx} - \int_\Omega K(x,v)\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

where for any $t \geq 0$

$$G(x,t) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^t g(x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \quad K(x,t) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^t k(x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

and g, k are the cut-off functions defined by

$$g(x,v(x)) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} v(x)^{-\delta} \text{ if } v(x) \geq \underline{u}(x), \\ \underline{u}(x)^{-\delta} \ \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$k(x,v(x)) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} f(x,\underline{u}(x)) & \text{if } v(x) \leq \underline{u}(x), \\ f(x,v(x)) & \text{if } \underline{u} \leq v(x) \leq \overline{u}(x), \\ f(x,\overline{u}(x)) & \text{if } v(x) \geq \overline{u}(x). \end{cases}$$

Notice that the method of proof of Theorem 0.4 when $\delta < 1$ does not apply here because $\int_\Omega F(x,v)dx$ with $F(x,t) = \int_0^t f(x,s)ds$ is not convex in v. That is the reason why we introduce the above cut-off function. Since f satisfies (0.1), E is coercive and weakly lower semicontinuous in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Using the compactness of any minimizing sequence $\{u_n\}$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ and the Lebesgue theorem, we can prove the existence of a global minimizer u to E. From Lemma A.2 in [**15**], we have that E is Gâteaux-differentiable in u and then u satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u - g(x,u) &= k(x,u) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Thus, from the weak comparison principle, we first get that $\underline{u} \leq u$ and then that $g(x,u) = u^{-\delta}$. Finally, still from the weak comparison principle we also obtain $u \leq \overline{u}$ from which we get $k(x,u) = f(x,u)$ and $u \in \mathcal{C}$.

Now, we deal with the second case. We use the following iterative scheme

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u_n - \frac{1}{u_n^\delta} + Ku_n &= f(x,u_{n-1}) + Ku_{n-1} \quad && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

with $u_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \underline{u}$ and $K > 0$ large enough such that $t \to Kt + f(x,t)$ is non decreasing (thanks to the uniform local lipschitz property of f) in $[0, \|\overline{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}]$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Note that the iterative scheme is well-defined and produces a sequence of element $u_n \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C} \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$. From the weak comparison principle, we have that $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a monotone increasing sequence such that $u_n \leq \overline{u}$. Then $u_n \uparrow u$ in $C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{C}$ and using the equation satisfied by u_n we deduce that $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and then converges to u in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Thus, by passing to the limit in the equation satisfied by u_n we obtain that u is a solution to (Q). Finally, the uniqueness of u follows from Theorem 3.1. □

We now give the proof of Theorem 0.10.

Proof. Let $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\Delta_t \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{T}{N}$. Following the main steps of the previous section, we are interested in constructing the sequence $(u^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, solutions to

$$u^n - \Delta_t \left(\Delta_p u^n + \frac{1}{(u^n)^\delta} \right) = \Delta_t f(x, u^{n-1}) + u^{n-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{3.4}$$

Applying Theorem 0.4 for each iteration n and since $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, we get the existence of $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C} \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. In fact, the previous inclusion is uniform in Δ_t. Indeed, since $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ we can choose $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ defined by (3.2) and (3.3) with $\eta > 0$ and $M > 0$ large enough so that $\underline{u} \leq u_0 \leq \overline{u}$. Then with $f \geq -L$ the weak comparison principle guarantees $\underline{u} \leq u_n \leq \overline{u}$, with $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ independent on Δ_t.

Next, let u_{Δ_t} and $\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}$ defined by (2.4) and set $u_{\Delta_t}(t) = u_0$ if $t < 0$. Then (2.5) is satisfied with $h_{\Delta_t}(t) \overset{\text{def}}{=} f(x, u_{\Delta_t}(t - \Delta_t))$ on $[0,T]$. Notice that from $u_{\Delta_t} \in [\underline{u}, \overline{u}]$ and $t \to f(x,t)$ continuous on $[\underline{u}, \overline{u}]$ it follows that $h_{\Delta_t}(t)$ is bounded in $L^\infty(Q_T)$ independently on n. Then by similar energy estimates as in the proof of Theorem 0.7 we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_{\Delta_t},\ \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \in L^\infty(0,T;\, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}),\\
&\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}}{\partial t} \in L^2(Q_T),\\
&u_{\Delta_t},\ \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \in L^\infty(Q_T),\\
&\frac{1}{(u_{\Delta_t})^\delta} \in L^\infty(0,T;\, W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)),\\
&\|\tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} - u_{\Delta_t}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(\Delta_t)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

uniformly on Δ_t. Then, taking $\Delta_t \to 0$, it follows that there exists $u \in L^\infty(0,T;\, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $u \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ and, up to a subsequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_{\Delta_t},\ \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} u \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0,T;\, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)) \text{ and in } L^\infty(Q_T),\\
&\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t}}{\partial t} \rightharpoonup \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \quad \text{in } L^2(Q_T).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Using similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 0.7, we get for $1 < q < +\infty$,

$$u_{\Delta_t}, \tilde{u}_{\Delta_t} \to u \ \text{ in } L^\infty(0,T;\, L^q(\Omega)) \ \text{ and } \ u \in C([0,T], L^q(\Omega)). \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover, if $K > 0$ denotes the Lipschitz constant of f on $[\underline{u}, \overline{u}]$ we have

$$\|f(x, u_{\Delta_t}(t - \Delta_t)) - f(x, u(t))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq K \|u_{\Delta_t}(t - \Delta_t) - u(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

and from (3.7) we deduce that $h_{\Delta_t} = f(x, u_{\Delta_t}(\cdot - \Delta_t)) \to f(x, u)$ in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$. Then by following the steps at the end of the proof of Theorem 0.7 we obtain that u is a weak solution to (P_t) in $\mathbf{V}(Q_T)$.

Next, let us prove that such a solution is unique. For that, let v be a weak solution to (P_t) in $\mathbf{V}(Q_T)$. Since $f(x, \cdot)$ is locally lipschitz uniformly in Ω, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\|u-v\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} &- \int_0^T < \Delta_p u - \Delta_p v, u - v > \mathrm{d}t \\ -\int_0^T\int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{u^\delta} - \frac{1}{v^\delta}\right)(u-v)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t &= \int_0^T\int_\Omega (f(x,u) - f(x,v))\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \\ &\le C\int_0^T\int_\Omega |u-v|^2\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \end{aligned}$$

which implies together with the Gronwall Lemma and (1.3), that $u \equiv v$. Finally, as in the proof of Theorem 0.7, we can prove that $u \in C([0, T]; W^{1,p}_0(\Omega))$ and that u satisfies (0.7). □

We now give the proof of Proposition 0.2.

Proof. (i) is the consequence of (0.5) together with the fact that f is locally lipschitz and the Gronwall Lemma.

Regarding assertion (ii), we follow the proof of Proposition 0.1: Assume without loss of generality that $t > s$. Then,

$$\|u(t)-u(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le \|u_0-u(t-s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_0^s \|f(x,u(\tau)) - f(x, u(\tau+t-s))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\mathrm{d}\tau.$$

From assertion (i) and the fact that f is Lipschitz on $[\underline{u}, \overline{u}]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)-u(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\le \|u_0 - u(t-s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \omega\int_0^s e^{\omega\tau}\mathrm{d}\tau\|u_0 - u(t-s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\le e^{\omega s}\|u_0 - u(t-s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we estimate the term $\|u_0 - u(t-s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_0 - u(t-s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\le \int_0^{t-s} \|Au_0 - f(x, u(\tau))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\le (t-s)\|Au_0 - f(x,u_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \omega\int_0^{t-s}\|u_0 - u(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\mathrm{d}\tau. \end{aligned}$$

From Gronwall lemma, we deduce that

$$\|u_0 - u(t-s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le (t-s)e^{\omega(t-s)}\|Au_0 - f(x,u_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

Gathering the above estimates, we get

$$\|u(t) - u(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le (t-s)e^{\omega t}\|Au_0 - f(x,u_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Then, the rest of the proof follows with the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 0.1. □

To end this section, we prove Theorem 0.12.

Proof. Let $\underline{u}$, $\overline{u} \in \mathcal{C} \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ be the subsolution and supersolution to

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rll} -\Delta_p u - \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} & = f(x,u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u & = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{array} \right. \tag{3.8}$$

which are defined by (3.2) and (3.3) where $\eta > 0$ is small enough and $M > 0$ is large enough so that $\underline{u} \le u_0 \le \overline{u}$. Note that it is possible since $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Thus, let u the solutions to (P_t) and u_1, u_2 the solutions to (P_t) with initial data $u_0 = \underline{u}$ and $u_0 = \overline{u}$ respectively, see Theorem 0.10. From (3.2) and (3.3), we have that

$$\underline{u},\ \overline{u} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Indeed, let $f, g \in W^{-1,\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)$ defined by $f \overset{\text{def}}{=} A\underline{u} \le 0$, $g \overset{\text{def}}{=} A\overline{u} \ge 0$ and $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ two sequences of $\mathcal{D}(A)$ defined by

$$Au_n = f_n \overset{\text{def}}{=} \max\{f, -n\}, \quad Av_n = g_n \overset{\text{def}}{=} \min\{g, n\}.$$

From the weak comparison principle, we have that $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is nonincreasing and $(v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is nondecreasing. Moreover, since $f_n \to f$ and $g_n \to g$ in $W^{-1,\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)$ as $n \to +\infty$, $u_n \to \underline{u}$ and $v_n \to \overline{u}$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as $n \to +\infty$. Therefore, $u_n \to \underline{u}$ and $v_n \to \overline{u}$ a.e. in Ω as $n \to \infty$. Consequently, using Dini's Theorem, we get that $u_n \to \underline{u}$ and $v_n \to \overline{u}$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $n \to +\infty$. From (3.9) and Theorem 0.10, we obtain that $u_1(t)$ and $u_2(t) \in C([0,T]; C_0(\overline{\Omega}))$. Furthermore, since $\underline{u}$, $\overline{u} \in \mathcal{C}$ are subsolution and supersolution respectively to (3.8), we have that the sequence $(\underline{u}^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(\overline{u}^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$) defined in (3.4) with $u_0 = \underline{u}$ ($u_0 = \overline{u}$ resp.,) is nondecreasing (nonincreasing resp.,) for any $0 < \Delta_t < 1/K$ where $K > 0$ is the Lipschitz constant of f on $[\underline{u}, \overline{u}]$. Moreover, the sequence $(u^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by (3.4) satisfies $\underline{u}^n \le u^n \le \overline{u}^n$ and it follows that $u_1(t) \le u(t) \le u_2(t)$ and that $t \to u_1(t)$ ($t \to u_2(t)$ resp.,) is nondecreasing (nonincreasing resp.,) and converges a.e. in Ω to u_1^∞ (u_2^∞ resp.), as $t \to \infty$. From the semigroup theory we have $u_1^\infty = \lim_{t'\to+\infty} S(t'+t)(\underline{u}) = S(t)(\lim\limits_{t'\to+\infty} S(t')\underline{u}) = S(t)u_1^\infty$ and analogously $u_2^\infty = S(t)u_2^\infty$, where $S(t)$ is the semigroup on $L^\infty(\Omega)$ generated by the evolution equation, and then u_1^∞ and u_2^∞ are stationary solutions to (P_t). From Theorem 0.6, we get that $u_1^\infty = u_2^\infty = u_\infty \in C(\overline{\Omega})$. Therefore, from Dini's Theorem we get that

$$u_1(t) \to u_\infty, \quad u_2(t) \to u_\infty \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ as } t \to \infty, \tag{3.10}$$

and then (0.8) follows since $u_1(t) \le u(t) \le u_2(t)$. □

4. The non degenerate case: $p = 2$

We start by proving the first part, as well as points (iv) and (v), of Theorem 0.13, namely:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $0 < \delta$, $T > 0$, $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ and let f satisfy assumptions in Theorem 0.10. Then there exists a unique solution $u \in C([0,T]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(Q_T)$ such that $u(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ a.e. $t \in [0,T]$, in the sense of distributions to*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_t - \Delta u - \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} = f(x,u) \quad \text{in } Q_T, \\ u = 0 \ \ \text{on } \Sigma_T, \quad u(0) = u_0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{array} \right. \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, points (iv) and (v) of Theorem 0.13 are satisfied.

Proof. First, for $g \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ let us prove the existence of a weak solution $u \in C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(Q_T)$ in the sense of distributions to

$$\begin{cases} u_t - \Delta u - \dfrac{1}{u^\delta} = g \quad \text{in } Q_T, \\ u = 0 \ \text{ on } \Sigma_T, \quad u(0) = u_0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Since $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\underline{u}_\epsilon \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ in the form (1.5) and (1.7) with $p = 2$ if $\delta \geq 1$ and $\underline{u}_\epsilon = \eta\phi_1$ if $\delta < 1$ (with $\eta > 0$ small enough) such that $\underline{u}_\epsilon \leq u_0$ and

$$-\Delta \underline{u}_\epsilon - \frac{1}{(\underline{u}_\epsilon + \epsilon)^\delta} \leq -\|g\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \quad \text{in } \ \Omega.$$

In addition, there exists $\overline{u}$ in the form given by (3.3) such that $u_0 \leq \overline{u}$ and verifying

$$-\Delta \bar{u} - \frac{1}{\bar{u}^\delta} \geq \|g\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then following the method and using estimates from Section 1 (in particular (2.6) with $p = 2$), we can prove the existence and the uniqueness of a positive solution $u_\epsilon \in L^\infty(Q_T) \cap L^2(0,T;\, H_0^1(\Omega))$, satisfying $\underline{u}_\epsilon \leq u_\epsilon \leq \overline{u}$, to

$$(\mathrm{P}_{\epsilon,t}) \begin{cases} u_t - \Delta u - \dfrac{1}{(u+\epsilon)^\delta} = g \quad \text{in } Q_T, \\ u = 0 \ \text{ on } \Sigma_T, \ \ u(0) = u_0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

From the weak comparison principle, we get that that if $0 \leq \tilde{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon$ then $u_\epsilon \leq u_{\tilde{\epsilon}}$ and $u_{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \tilde{\epsilon} \leq u_\epsilon + \epsilon$. This last inequality is obtained by remarquing that $v_\epsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} u_\epsilon + \epsilon$ and $v_{\tilde{\epsilon}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} u_{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \tilde{\epsilon}$ obeys

$$\begin{cases} (v_{\tilde{\epsilon}} - v_\epsilon)_t - \Delta(v_{\tilde{\epsilon}} - v_\epsilon) - \dfrac{1}{(v_{\tilde{\epsilon}})^\delta} + \dfrac{1}{(v_\epsilon)^\delta} = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_T, \\ v_{\tilde{\epsilon}} - v_\epsilon \leq 0 \ \text{ on } \Sigma_T, \quad \text{and } \ v_{\tilde{\epsilon}}(0) - v_\epsilon(0) \leq 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

It follows that $(u_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(Q_T)$ and there exists $u \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ satisfying $\underline{u} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \lim\limits_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \underline{u}_\epsilon \leq u \leq \overline{u}$ and such that $u_\epsilon \to u$ in $L^\infty(Q_T)$ as $\epsilon \to 0^+$. Therefore, u is uniformly in $\mathcal{C}$. Then, passing to the limit as $\epsilon \to 0^+$, it is easy to get from (4.3) that u is a solution in the sense of distributions to (4.2). Finally, since $(u_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ is also a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(0,T;\, L^2(\Omega))$, and since one has $u_\epsilon \in C([0,T];\, L^2(\Omega))$ (by regularity results for the heat equation) then $u \in C([0,T];\, L^2(\Omega))$. To prove the uniqueness of u, let us suppose that $v \in L^\infty(Q_T) \cap C([0,T], L^2(\Omega))$, $v(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ a.e., is another solution (in the sense of distributions) to (4.2). Then su bstracting the equation satisfied by v to (4.2) and doing the dual product in $H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $(-\Delta)^{-1}(u - v)$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\|u(t) - v(t)\|^2_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \quad &+ \quad 2\|u(t) - v(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &+ \quad 2\int_\Omega \Big(\frac{1}{v(t)^\delta} - \frac{1}{u(t)^\delta}\Big)(-\Delta)^{-1}(u(t) - v(t))\mathrm{d}x = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{((-\Delta)^{-1}\cdot|\cdot)_{H_0^1(\Omega),H^{-1}(\Omega)}}$ is a norm on $H^{-1}(\Omega)$. Note that from Hardy's inequality the last above term is well-defined since for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$ we have $(-\Delta)^{-1}(u(t) - v(t)) \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ ($u(t)$, $v(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ implies $\frac{1}{v(t)^\delta} - \frac{1}{u(t)^\delta} \in H^{-\frac{3}{2}+\eta}(\Omega) \subset (H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega))'$ for $0 < \eta < \frac{2}{1+\delta}$ because $H_0^{\frac{3}{2}-\eta}(\Omega)$ is a subset of

$H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ (see Grisvard [**17**] and Lemma (4.8) below), and it is positive since $(-\Delta)^{-1}$ is monotone. Then integrating over $(0,T)$ and taking into account $u(0) = v(0) = u_0 \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ yields $u \equiv v$.

Let us now prove the existence and uniqueness of the solution to (4.1). For that we now consider $\underline{u}$, $\overline{u}$ defined by (3.2), (3.3) (subsolution and supersolution to the stationary equation (4.2), resp.) and obeying $\underline{u} \leq u_0 \leq \overline{u}$. For z_1, z_2 in $\{\underline{u} \leq u \leq \overline{u}\} \cap C([0,T];\, L^2(\Omega))$ we consider u_ϵ^1 (resp. u_ϵ^2) the solution to $(\mathrm{P}_{\epsilon,t})$ for $g = f(x, z_1)$ ($g = f(x, z_2)$, resp.). By multiplying by $u_\epsilon^1 - u_\epsilon^2$ the equation satisfied by $u_\epsilon^1 - u_\epsilon^2$, integrating over $(0,t)$, and taking into account that $f(x,\cdot)$ is lipschitz in $[0, \|\overline{u}\|_\infty]$, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |u_\epsilon^1(t) - u_\epsilon^2(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}x + 2\int_0^t \int_\Omega |\nabla(u_\epsilon^1 - u_\epsilon^2)|^2 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \leq 2\omega \int_0^t \int_\Omega |z_1(t) - z_2(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t,$$

for a positive constant $\omega > 0$ depending on $\|\overline{u}\|_\infty$ but not in z_1, z_2. From the weak comparison principle we deduce that $\underline{u}_\epsilon \leq u_\epsilon^i \leq \overline{u}$, $i = 1, 2$, and by passing to the limit $\epsilon \to 0^+$ we obtain that the solution to (4.2) for $g = f(x, z_1)$ (resp. $g = f(x, z_2)$) obeys:

(4.4)
$$\int_\Omega |u^1(t) - u^2(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}x \leq 2\omega \int_0^t \int_\Omega |z_1(t) - z_2(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \quad \text{ and } \quad \underline{u} \leq u^i \leq \overline{u},\ i = 1, 2.$$

Then by applying the fixed point Theorem in $\{\underline{u} \leq u \leq \overline{u}\} \cap C([0,T];\, L^2(\Omega))$ for $T = T(\|\overline{u}\|_\infty) > 0$ small enough, we get the existence of a weak solution (in the sense of distributions), $u \in \{\underline{u} \leq u \leq \overline{u}\} \cap C([0,T];\, L^2(\Omega))$, to (0.9). Thus, since $f(x,\cdot)$ is lipschitz in $[0, \|\overline{u}\|_\infty]$, we can extend u in $[0, +\infty)$ and $u \in C([0,+\infty);\, L^2(\Omega))$. Note that the uniqueness of the solution is an obvious consequence of (4.4). Finally, if u_ϵ^i is the solution to (4.3) with $u_0 = u_{0,i}$ and $g = f(x, u_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, then by multiplying by $u_\epsilon^1 - u_\epsilon^2$ the equation satisfied by $u_\epsilon^1 - u_\epsilon^2$ and integrating over $(0,t)$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |u_\epsilon^1(t) - u_\epsilon^2(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}x + 2\lambda_1 \int_0^t \int_\Omega |u_\epsilon^1 - u_\epsilon^2|^2 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \quad &\leq \\ 2\int_0^t \int_\Omega (f(x,u_1) - f(x,u_2))(u_\epsilon^1 - u_\epsilon^2) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \quad &+ \quad \int_\Omega (u_{0,1} - u_{0,2})^2 \mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_1 > 0$ is the first eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian ($\int_\Omega |\nabla z|^2 \mathrm{d}x \geq \lambda_1 \int_\Omega |z|^2 \mathrm{d}x$ for all $z \in H_0^1(\Omega)$). Then (0.10) is obtained by passing to the limit $\epsilon \to 0^+$ and by applying Gronwall Lemma. ☐

Next, we discuss the regularity of solutions to (4.2). Precisely, we prove the following result:

Theorem 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, $\forall \eta > 0$ small enough, we have that any solution u to* (4.2) *satisfies:*

(i) *if $\delta < 1$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap H^{2-\eta}(\Omega)$, then $u \in C([0,T];\, H^{2-\eta}(\Omega))$;*
(ii) *if $\frac{1}{2} \leq \delta < 1$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap H^{\frac{5}{2}-\delta-\eta}(\Omega)$, then $u \in C([0,T];\, H^{\frac{5}{2}-\delta-\eta}(\Omega))$;*
(iii) *if $\delta \geq 1$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2}{\delta+1}-\eta}(\Omega)$, then $u \in C([0,T];\, H^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2}{\delta+1}-\eta}(\Omega))$.*

To prove Theorem 4.2, we will use the interpolation theory in Sobolev spaces (see Grisvard [**17**], Triebel [**28**]) and Hardy inequalities. In this regard, we adopt the following notation: let X, Y be two banach spaces, by $X \subset Y$ we mean that X is continuously imbedded in Y. Let us recall some definitions and properties of interpolation spaces theory (see Triebel [**28**] for more details):

Definition 4.3. Let A_0, A_1 be two Banach spaces. For $\theta \in (0,1)$, $1 \le q < \infty$, following the K-method due to J. Peetre, we can define the following interpolation space:

$$(A_0, A_1)_{\theta,q} = \left\{ a \in A_0 + A_1 \middle| \, \|a\|_{(A_0,A_1)_{\theta,q}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left(\int_0^\infty t^{-\theta} K(t,a)^q \mathrm{d}t \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} < \infty \right\},$$

and for $q = \infty$,

$$(A_0, A_1)_{\theta,\infty} = \left\{ a \in A_0 + A_1 \middle| \, \|a\|_{(A_0,A_1)_{\theta,\infty}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{0<t<\infty} t^{-\theta} K(t,a)^q < \infty \right\},$$

with

$$K(t,a) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{a=a_1+a_2} (\|a_0\|_{A_0} + t\|a_1\|_{A_1}) \quad \text{for } a \in A_0 + A_1.$$

Remark 4.4. Classical examples of interpolation spaces are the Lorentz spaces $L^{p,q}(\Omega) = (L^1(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega))_{\frac{p-1}{p},q}$ and $L^{p,\infty}(\Omega)$ known as the weak L^p-space of Marcienkewicz (note that $L^{p,p}(\Omega) = L^p(\Omega)$).

We now recall some properties satisfied by interpolation spaces that we will use in the proof of Theorem 4.2 (see [**28**, Thm. 1.3.3.1, Par. 1.3.3, p.25 and Par. 1.12.2, Thm 1.12.2.1, p.69]):

Proposition 4.1. *Let A_0, A_1 be two Banach spaces. Let $\theta \in (0,1)$, $1 \le q < \infty$. Then,*

(i) $A_0 \cap A_1 \subset (A_0,A_1)_{\theta,q} \subset A_0 + A_1$ *and* $(A_0,A_1)_{\theta,q} = (A_1,A_0)_{1-\theta,q}$*;*

(ii) *if* $q \le \tilde{q} < \infty$*, then*
$$(A_0,A_1)_{\theta,1} \subset (A_0,A_1)_{\theta,q} \subset (A_0,A_1)_{\theta,\tilde{q}} \subset (A_0,A_1)_{\theta,\infty};$$

(iii) *if* $A_0 \subset A_1$*, then for* $\theta < \tilde{\theta} < 1$, $1 \le \tilde{q} \le \infty$, $(A_0,A_1)_{\theta,q} \subset (A_0,A_1)_{\tilde{\theta},\tilde{q}}$ *holds;*

(iv) $\exists c_{\theta,q}$ *such that* $\forall a \in A_0 \cap A_1$, $\|a\|_{(A_0,A_1)_{\theta,q}} \le c_{\theta,q} \|a\|_{A_0}^{1-\theta} \|a\|_{A_1}^{\theta}$.

(v) *(Duality Theorem) If* $A_0 \cap A_1$ *is dense both in* A_0 *and* A_1 *then*
$$(A_0,A_1)'_{\theta,p} = (A'_0, A'_1)_{\theta,\frac{p}{p-1}}.$$

(vi) *(Interpolation Theorem) Let* B_0, B_1 *be two Banach spaces. If* L *is a linear continuous mapping from* A_0 *to* B_0 *as well as from* A_1 *to* B_1 *then* L *is linear continuous from* $(A_0,A_1)_{\theta,q}$ *to* $(B_0,B_1)_{\theta,q}$.

Finally, we give the definition and some basic properties of the space of traces introduced by J. L. Lions (see triebel [**28**] and Benssoussan-Da Prato-Delfour-Mitter [**5**] for more general details):

Definition 4.5. Let X_0, X_1 two Banach spaces such that $X_0 \subset X_1$ (densely). For $1 < q < \infty$, let $W_q(0,\infty,X_0,X_1)$ and $T(q,X_0,X_1)$ the Banach spaces

$$W_q(0,\infty,X_0,X_1) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{u \in L^q(0,\infty;X_0) |\, u_t \in L^q(0,\infty;X_1)\},$$

equipped with the norm $\left(\int_0^\infty \|u\|_{X_0}^q + \|u_t\|_{X_1}^q \mathrm{d}t\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ and

$$T(q,X_0,X_1) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X_1 \, : \, \exists u \in W_q(0,\infty,X_0,X_1),\, u(0) = x\},$$

endowed by the norm

$$\|x\|_{T(q,X_0,X_1)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \inf\left\{\|u\|_{W_q(0,\infty,X_0,X_1)} \,:\, u(0)=x\right\}.$$

The space of traces $T(q,X_0,X_1)$ (under the assumptions given in Definition 4.5) has the following properties (see [**28**, Thm. 1.8.2.1 (2), Par.1.8.2, p.44] or [**5**, Part II, Chap. 1, Par. 4.2]):

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that the conditions given in Definition 4.5 hold. Then, we have:*

1. $X_0 \subset T(q,X_0,X_1) \subset X_1$;
2. $u \in C\left([0,\infty); T(q,X_0,X_1)\right)$ *for any* $u \in W_q(0,\infty,X_0,X_1)$;
3. *(Equivalence Theorem) let* $0<\theta=\frac{1}{q}<1$, *then* $T(q,X_0,X_1) \approx (X_0,X_1)_{\theta,q}$.

We recall now some basic facts about fractional powers of $-\Delta$ with domain $\mathcal{D}(-\Delta)=H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, i.e. $(-\Delta)^\theta$ with domain $\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ for $\theta\in[0,1]$ (see for instance [**28**, Par. 1.15.1, p. 98 and Par. 1.18.10, p. 141] or [**22**, Chap. 2, Par. 2.6] for the definition):

Proposition 4.3. *Let* $\theta\in[0,1]$.

1. $\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta) = (\mathcal{D}(\Delta), L^2(\Omega))_{1-\theta,2}$
2. $\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta) = \begin{cases} H^{2\theta}(\Omega) & \text{if } 0\le\theta<\frac{1}{4},\\ \tilde{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) & \text{if } \theta=\frac{1}{4},\\ H_0^{2\theta}(\Omega) & \text{if } \frac{1}{4}<\theta\le 1.\end{cases}$
   where $\tilde{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{v\in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) \,|\, d(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}v \in L^2(\Omega)\}$.
3. $-\Delta^\theta$ *is an isomorphism from* $\mathcal{D}(-\Delta)$ *onto* $\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\theta})$ *as well as from* $L^2(\Omega)$ *onto* $(\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta))'$ *(the dual space of* $(\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta))$*).*

Remark 4.6. Note that since we are in a Hilbertian framework, the real interpolation space $(\mathcal{D}(\Delta), L^2(\Omega))_{1-\theta,2}$ coincides with the complex interpolation space $[\mathcal{D}(\Delta), L^2(\Omega)]_{1-\theta}$, see [**28**, Par. 1.9, p. 55 and Par. 1.8.10, Rem. 3 p. 143].

Proof. The first point follows from the fact that $-\Delta$ is positive and sel-adjoint, see [**28**, Thm. 1.18.10.1, par. 1.18.1 p.141]. The second point is a consequence of the characterization of $(H^2(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega), L^2(\Omega))_{1-\theta,2}$ obtained from [**28**, Thm. 4.3.3.1, Par. 4.3.3, p.321] or from [**16**]. The first part of the last point follows from [**28**, Thm. 1.15.2.1, p.101] and the second part is deduced with a duality argument (combined with the self-adjointness of $-\Delta$) from the fact that $-\Delta$ is an isomorphism from $\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta)$ onto $L^2(\Omega)$. □

For $1<q<\infty$, setting the Banach space

$$\mathcal{X}_{q,\theta,T} \overset{\text{def}}{=} W_q(0,T;\, \mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\theta}),\, (\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta))'),$$

we have the following result:

Lemma 4.7. *Let* $\theta\in[0,1)$ *and* $q>\frac{2}{1-\theta}$*. let* L_T *the linear operator defined by* $L_T(f)\overset{\text{def}}{=} z$, *where* z *is the solution to*

$$\begin{cases} z_t-\Delta z = f \quad \text{in } Q_T,\\ z=0 \text{ on } \Sigma_T; \quad z(0)=0 \text{ in } \Omega.\end{cases}$$

Then L_T *is a bounded operator from* $L^q(0,T;\, (\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta)'))$ *into* $\mathcal{X}_{q,\theta,T}$ *as well as from* $L^q(0,T;\, (\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta)')$ *into* $C([0,T],\, \mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\theta-\frac{2}{q}}))$.

Proof. Since $(-\Delta)$ generates an analytic semigroup, denoted by $e^{t\Delta}$, in $L^2(\Omega)$, then L_T is a continuous operator from $L^q(0,T;\, L^2(\Omega))$ onto $W_q(0,T;\, \mathcal{D}(-\Delta), L^2(\Omega))$ (see [**?**, Par. 4.2]). Therefore, since $(-\Delta)^\theta$ is an isomorphism from $\mathcal{D}(-\Delta)$ onto $\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\theta})$ and from $L^2(\Omega)$ onto $\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta)'$ and from the fact that $(-\Delta)^\theta$ and L commute, the first statement of the Lemma follows. We prove now the second statement. Let $T' > T$ and set

$$\hat{f} \in L^\infty(Q_{T'}) \ \text{ defined by } \hat{f}(t,\cdot) \begin{cases} f(t,\cdot) \text{ if } t \le T \\ 0 \ \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $\hat{u} \overset{\text{def}}{=} L_{T'}(\hat{f})$. Then, we define the extension function $u_1(t,\cdot) = \hat{u}(t,\cdot)$ if $t \le T'$ and $u_1(t,\cdot) = 0$ otherwise. We have that $u_1|_{Q_T} = L_T(f) = u$. Let $\chi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a smooth non-increasing function such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on $[0,T]$ and $\chi \equiv 0$ on $[T', +\infty)$. Then, for $u \in \mathcal{X}_{q,\theta,T}$ we have $\chi u_1 \in \mathcal{X}_{q,\theta,\infty}$. Thus, from Proposition 4.2, $\chi u_1 \in C([0,+\infty), \big(\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\theta}), (\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta))'\big)_{\frac{1}{q},q})$ and therefore,

$$u \in C([0,T], \big(\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\theta}), (\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta))'\big)_{\frac{1}{q},q}).$$

Furthermore, from the interpolation Theorem we have

$$\big(\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\theta}), (\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^\theta))'\big)_{\frac{1}{q},q} = (-\Delta)^\theta \left((\mathcal{D}(-\Delta), L^2(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{q},q} \right)$$

and from Propositions 4.1 and 4.3, we get

$$\big(\mathcal{D}(-\Delta), L^2(\Omega)\big)_{\frac{1}{q},q} \subset \big(\mathcal{D}(-\Delta), L^2(\Omega)\big)_{\frac{2}{q},1} \subset \big(\mathcal{D}(-\Delta), L^2(\Omega)\big)_{\frac{2}{q},2} = \mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\frac{2}{q}}).$$

From above, it follows that

$$u \in C([0,T], \mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{1-\theta-\frac{2}{q}})).$$

□

Let us also recall the following Hardy type inequalities which can be obtained from [**28**, Par. 3.2.6, Lem. 3.2.6.1, p.259].

Lemma 4.8. *Let $s \in [0,2]$ such that $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$ and $s \neq \frac{3}{2}$. Then the following generalisation of Hardy's inequality holds:*

$$\|d^{-s} g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C \|g\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \qquad \textit{for all } g \in H^s_0(\Omega). \tag{4.5}$$

We now prove Theorem 4.2.

Proof. First, notice that with the notation of Lemma 4.7 the solution u of (4.1) obeys

$$u(t) = e^{\Delta t} u_0 + L_T \left(\frac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u) \right)(t).$$

In the following we suppose that $0 < \eta < \frac{1}{1+\delta}$. If $0 \le \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ then since $u \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $\frac{1}{u^\delta} = O(\frac{1}{d(x)^\delta})$ and it implies that $\frac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u) \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then using Lemma 4.7 we obtain $L_T(\frac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u)) \in C([0,T], H^{2-\eta}(\Omega))$. If $\frac{1}{2} \le \delta < 1$, then from $u \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $\frac{1}{u^\delta} = O(\frac{1}{d(x)^\delta})$ and by Lemma 4.8 it implies that $\frac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u) \in C([0,T], (H_0^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\eta}{2}}(\Omega))') = C([0,T], (\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{\eta}{4}}))')$ (since $\frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\eta}{4} \in (0, \frac{3}{4})$). Then Lemma 4.7 with $q = \frac{4}{\eta}$ gives $L_T(\frac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u)) \in C([0,T], H^{\frac{5}{2}-\delta-\eta}(\Omega))$. Next, if $\delta \ge 1$ then by Lemma 4.8 we have $\frac{1}{u^\delta} + f(x,u) \in C([0,T], (H_0^{\frac{2\delta}{\delta+1}-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\eta}{2}}(\Omega))') =$

$C([0,T],(\mathcal{D}((-\Delta)^{\frac{\delta}{\delta+1}-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{\eta}{4}}))')$ (since $\frac{\delta}{\delta+1}-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{\eta}{4}\in(0,\frac{3}{4})$). Therefore, using Lemma 4.7 with $q=\frac{2}{\eta}$ we get that $L_T(\frac{1}{u^\delta}+f(x,u))\in C([0,T],H^{\frac{5}{2}-\frac{2\delta}{\delta+1}-\eta}(\Omega))$. As a consequence, if $u_0\in X_\eta$ defined by

$$X_\eta=\begin{cases} H^{2-\eta}(\Omega) & \text{if } \delta<\frac{1}{2},\\ H^{\frac{5}{2}-\delta-\eta}(\Omega) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2}\le\delta<1,\\ H^{\frac{5}{2}-\frac{2\delta}{\delta+1}-\eta}(\Omega) & \text{if } 1\le\delta,\end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

then $t\to u(t)=e^{t\Delta}u_0+L_T(\frac{1}{u^\delta}+f(x,u))(t)\in C([0,T],X_\eta)$. □

Then Theorem 0.13 follows from Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. We end this section by proving Theorem 0.15.

Proof. Let $\delta<3$ and $u_0\in H_0^1(\Omega)\cap\mathcal{C}$. Then, from Theorem 0.10, Theorem 0.12 and Theorem 0.13, the solution to (0.9) is unique, belongs to $C([0,+\infty),\ H_0^1(\Omega))$ and satisfies $\underline{u}\le u\le\overline{u}$ (with $\underline{u}$, $\overline{u}$ as in the proof of Theorem 0.13), and

$$u(t)\to u_\infty\quad\text{in } L^\infty(\Omega)\ \text{ as } t\to+\infty,$$

where u_∞ is given by Theorem 0.6 with $p=2$. To complete the proof of Theorem 0.15, let us show that

$$u(t)\to u_\infty\quad\text{in } H_0^1(\Omega)\ \text{ as } t\to+\infty. \tag{4.7}$$

For that, let $0<\eta<\min(\frac{1}{2},\frac{3-\delta}{2(1+\delta)})$ and note that X_η defined by (4.6) is compactely embedded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, for any $t>0$, using Lemma 4.7 as in the proof of Theorem 4.2 and the fact that $u_0\in\mathcal{C}\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have for $t'\ge t$,

$$t'\to S(t')u_0=e^{t'\Delta}u_0+L_{t'}(\frac{1}{u^\delta}+f(x,u))\in C([t,+\infty),\ X_\eta), \tag{4.8}$$

and since $\underline{u}\le u\le\overline{u}$,

$$\sup_{[t,+\infty]}\|u(t)\|_{X_\eta}<+\infty. \tag{4.9}$$

From the compactness embedding of X_η in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ together with (4.9), (4.7) follows. □

References

[1] Aomar Anane. Simplicité et isolation de la première valeur propre du p-laplacien avec poids. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 305(16):725–728, 1987.

[2] Aomar Anane. Etude des valeurs propres et de la résonance pour l'opérateur p-laplacien. *Thèse de doctorat, Université Libre de Bruxelles*, 1988.

[3] Carlos Aranda and Tomas Godoy. Existence and multiplicity of positive solutions for a singular problem associated to the p-Laplacian operator. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 132, 15 pp. (electronic), 2004.

[4] Viorel Barbu. *Nonlinear differential equations of monotone types in Banach spaces.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2010.

[5] A. Bensoussan, G. Da Prato, M. C. Delfour, and S. K. Mitter. *Representation and control of infinite dimensional systems.* Systems & Control: Foundations & ApplicationsḂirkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, second edition, 2007.

[6] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz, and L. Tartar. On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 2(2):193–222, 1977.

[7] Mabel Cuesta and Peter Takáč. A strong comparison principle for positive solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Differential Integral Equations*, 13(4-6):721–746, 2000.

[8] Juan Dávila and Marcelo Montenegro. Existence and asymptotic behavior for a singular parabolic equation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357(5):1801–1828 (electronic), 2005.

[9] Klaus Deimling. *Nonlinear functional analysis.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.

[10] Jesús Ildefonso Díaz and José Evaristo Saá. Existence et unicité de solutions positives pour certaines équations elliptiques quasilinéaires. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 305(12):521–524, 1987.

[11] E. DiBenedetto. $C^{1+\alpha}$ local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 7(8):827–850, 1983.

[12] Pavel Drábek and Jesús Hernández. Existence and uniqueness of positive solutions for some quasilinear elliptic problems. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 44(2, Ser. A: Theory Methods):189–204, 2001.

[13] Jacqueline Fleckinger-Pellé and Peter Takáč. Uniqueness of positive solutions for nonlinear cooperative systems with the p-Laplacian. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 43(4):1227–1253, 1994.

[14] Marius Ghergu and Vicenţiu D. Rădulescu. *Singular elliptic problems: bifurcation and asymptotic analysis*, volume 37 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications.* The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.

[15] Jacques Giacomoni, Ian Schindler, and Peter Takáč. Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and existence of multiple solutions for a singular quasilinear equation. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 6(1):117–158, 2007.

[16] P. Grisvard. Caractérisation de quelques espaces d'interpolation. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 25:40–63, 1967.

[17] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, volume 24 of *Monographs and Studies in Mathematics.* Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1985.

[18] J. Hernández and F. J. Mancebo. Singular elliptic and parabolic equations. *Handbook of Differential Equations*, 3:317–400, 2006.

[19] Jesús Hernández, Francisco J. Mancebo, and José M. Vega. On the linearization of some singular, nonlinear elliptic problems and applications. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 19(6):777–813, 2002.

[20] Gary Lieberman. Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 12(11):1203–1219, 1988.

[21] Peter Lindqvist. On the equation $\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) + \lambda |u|^{p-2}u = 0$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 109(1):157–164, 1990.

[22] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, volume 44 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.

[23] Kanishka Perera and Elves A. B. Silva. On singular p-Laplacian problems. *Differential Integral Equations*, 20(1):105–120, 2007.

[24] James Serrin. Local behavior of solutions of quasi-linear equations. *Acta Math.*, 111:247–302, 1964.

[25] Peter Takáč. Stabilization of positive solutions for analytic gradient-like systems. *Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems*, 6(4):947–973, 2000.

[26] Peter Tolksdorf. On the Dirichlet problem for quasilinear equations in domains with conical boundary points. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 8(7):773–817, 1983.

[27] Peter Tolksdorf. Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 51(1):126–150, 1984.

[28] H. Triebel. *Interpolation theory, function spaces, differential operators.* Johann Ambrosius Barth, Heidelberg, second edition, 1995.

[29] J. L. Vázquez. A strong maximum principle for some quasilinear elliptic equations. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 12(3):191–202, 1984.

[30] Michael Winkler. Nonuniqueness in the quenching problem. *Math. Ann.*, 339(3):559–597, 2007.

LMAP (UMR 5142), Bat. IPRA, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, Avenue de l'Université, 64013 cedex Pau, France
E-mail address: `mehdi.badra@univ-pau.fr`

LMAP (UMR 5142), Bat. IPRA, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, Avenue de l'Université, 64013 cedex Pau, France
E-mail address: `kaushik.bal@univ-pau.fr`

LMAP (UMR 5142), Bat. IPRA, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, Avenue de l'Université, 64013 cedex Pau, France
E-mail address: `jgiacomo@univ-pau.fr`